

such dispute. Nothing contained in said antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of agricultural, horticultural, or commercial organizations instituted for mutual benefit without capital stock and not conducted for the pecuniary profit of either such organization or the members thereof, or to forbid or restrain such members from carrying out said objects in a lawful way.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 6357. An act to authorize the establishment of a bureau of war-risk insurance; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to correct error in H. R. 12045.

RECESS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Tuesday, September 1, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, September 2, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, September 1, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that every age has its problems to solve, since in solving them the manly virtues are developed to a higher degree of perfection; and we bless Thee that men look at these problems and their solution from different angles, so that when they are solved they are apt to be solved right, for we realize that no question is ever settled until it is settled right. Help us, we beseech Thee, to think right, to do right, that we may solve the problems of our day in accordance with the eternal fitness of things, and Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair could not understand what the gentleman said.

Mr. BUTLER. It is the same point of order that I made yesterday and will make to-morrow and hereafter.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. BUTLER. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Elder	Hoxworth	Nelson
Aiken	Esch	Johnson, S. C.	O'Shaunessy
Ainey	Estopinal	Jones	Palmer
Ansberry	Evans	Kelley, Mich.	Patten, N. Y.
Aswell	Fairchild	Kent	Peters
Austin	Falcon	Key, Ohio	Powers
Barchfield	Farr	Kless, Pa.	Ragsdale
Bartlett	Fess	Kindel	Rainey
Bell, Ga.	Finley	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Riordan
Browne, Wis.	FitzHenry	Knowland, J. R.	Sabath
Browning	Fowler	L'Engle	Scully
Buchanan, Ill.	Gardner	Lenroot	Shackleford
Byrnes, S. C.	George	Levy	Sherley
Caldier	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Cantor	Goldfogle	Lindquist	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Gordon	Loft	Steenerson
Casey	Graham, Ill.	Logue	Stevens, N. H.
Chandler	Graham, Pa.	McClellan	Stringer
Church	Griest	McGillcuddy	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Griffin	Mahan	Treadway
Covington	Guernsey	Martin	Underhill
Crisp	Hardwick	Merritt	Wallin
Curry	Hart	Montague	Watkins
Dixon	Hensley	Morin	Wilson, N. Y.
Dooling	Hill	Mott	Witherspoon
Eagle	Hinds	Murdock	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members have answered to their names—a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey rises to a question of personal privilege. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it has to do with an article that appeared in the Newark Star of yesterday. The Newark Star is owned, operated, and controlled by one James Smith, jr., at one time United States Senator from the State of New Jersey, and sometimes known as "Sugar Jim."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. The former United States Senator from New Jersey says that the gentleman from New Jersey—

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman will have to state what his question of privilege rests on.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. It rests on the statement made that the gentleman from New Jersey—that I was absent five times out of six during my service here in Congress.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a question of privilege—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman has a question of privilege, he does not have to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. BORLAND. I renew the request that the gentleman have leave to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me we ought to determine at some time whether every Member of the House who has been absent, who makes the request for unanimous consent, has a matter of personal privilege to rise and discuss the question for an hour—

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I do not ask for an hour.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Or have unanimous consent for half an hour to make excuses.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I am not going to make any excuses; the gentleman from Illinois, the leader of the Republican Party in the House, knows that I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether or not the Speaker has ruled on the question whether this is a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman I think we all recognize the importance of a Member having the right to explain a charge against him, but I think it is an unfortunate day to bring it up, and if the gentleman can I would like to ask him to postpone it until to-morrow. To-day is unanimous-consent day.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Give me 15 minutes to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman asks for 15 minutes, I will not object.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the leading editorial of the Newark Star, which, as I stated before, is owned and edited and controlled by one James Smith, jr., former United States Senator from the State of New Jersey, sometimes known in our State and elsewhere throughout the United States as "Sugar Jim," and whose fame rests upon his characterization as a traitor by Grover Cleveland, has this to say of me:

[From the Newark Star, James Smith, Jr.]

KINKEAD ESCAPED FROM CUSTODY.

Proudly marching at the head of a Moose organization in Jersey City on Saturday was Congressman EUGENE KINKEAD, escaped from the custody of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, after he had been apprehended for constant and persistent violation of his sworn obligations to his constituents. Kinkead could not miss the opportunity to make this local display of himself for the sake of the capital in his chase for a \$10,000 office. Every voter in Hudson County now knows that Kinkead has absented himself from his duties in Congress an average of five days out of every six, and that he was compelled late last week to make a temporary appearance at Washington by the Sergeant at Arms, while Congress voted to cut out his salary of \$21 a day for absences, and here he was on Saturday appearing in the public streets in Jersey City looking for Moose votes and defying all the decencies. Is it such men as this chronic and shameless defaulter in important public duties at a time when every Congressman should be at his post that the people reward with fat offices? How much more of KINKEAD can the people of Hudson County stand?

[Laughter and applause.]

Thus closes the editorial of the quondam Senator from New Jersey. Here is an editorial by another paper that takes a bang at me occasionally. "Always absent from his post," starteth the editorial of the Hudson Observer, ably edited by one Mathias C. Ely, at one time secretary to James Smith, jr., and now an important figure in the Democratic county opposed to the intelligent electorate of the Democracy of our county. "Always absent from his post." I am not going to read this, because I have not the time, but I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by inserting this and putting in this ex-Senator's record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing certain excerpts from newspapers—

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. And the record of one James Smith, jr., one-time Senator from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall object to printing the record of some one who can not answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to that part of the request. Is there any objection to printing the editorials? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read his record.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I can not; it is a mile long.

ALWAYS ABSENT FROM HIS POST.

Every man elected by the people to sit in either House of Congress ought in these days of trouble to be in his place at Washington assisting the President of the United States to maintain peace and neutrality, to keep moving the wheels of commerce, and to devise ways and means to protect the people from the avarice of the speculators in food and other necessities of life.

This duty should appeal peculiarly to Congressman KINKEAD, who belongs to the dominant party, is a Member from the President's own State, and is presumed to have the experience that results from a considerable length of service.

It is not at all creditable to the Democratic Party to have one of the men upon whom it has bestowed high honors absent five out of every six days of the session, leaving upon the shoulders of other men the hard and thoughtful work of a critical time.

Such conduct is all the more objectionable in view of the circumstances that surround his neglect. Mr. KINKEAD has a variety of money-making occupations, public and private, ranging all the way from the building of roads in the new Palisades Park on the Hudson to the proprietorship of a street car advertising agency. He has two political offices, a third "on ice," and now wants a fourth. Nearly everything he possesses was gained through the generosity of the party to which he belongs.

He is now spending most of his time going about the county of Hudson trying to assemble the rag-tag and bobtails who constituted the old foes of the President, riding in the process roughshod over his friend Closser and others who helped him in his political career.

He is in this matter as false to Wilson, who has been good to him, as he is to his constituents, whose interests he is betraying by his absence from his post in the House of Representatives.

Congressman KINKEAD is very much mistaken if he thinks his course will be approved at the primaries. The organizations have already condemned him and indorsed one of his rivals in Bayonne, West Hoboken, Hoboken, Kearny, and Secaucus, and they will pass adversely upon his candidacy in Jersey City, Union Hill, and nearly all of the smaller municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the former United States Senator and the former Senator's secretary is this, that what I say about the secretary he will print, because he is a man; he is not a coward. The former United States Senator will not print any of it—I will not say he is a coward, because I like Smith personally. [Laughter.] And now, in order that my colleagues might know who this gentleman is who so venomously addresseth himself regarding one of your colleagues, I read from the Congressional Directory of the Fifty-third Congress and find that James Smith, jr., of Newark, was born in that city June 12, 1851, and I ask unanimous consent to insert his biography in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the biography of ex-Senator James Smith, of New Jersey, as printed in the Congressional Directory of the Fifty-third Congress. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I just want to call attention to this statement. You see all I got was from the party, according to Smith. He says:

He has been tendered nearly every office in the gift of his party in the State, but has always refused office; is a manufacturer of patent and enameled leather in Newark, and conducts the largest business of the kind in the country.

At one time Senator Bailey was down in Texas, and he was making a speech, I think, in Waco, Tex., I am not sure of the town. There was a youngster who was sent out by his father to get supper supplies. He left in the afternoon and when he finally returned, carrying the bundles in his arms, his father said, "What is the matter; why did you stay so long?" "Well," he said, "Dad, I was down at the corner of Main and Washington Streets, and I heard a man talk there; I got interested and stayed overtime." The father said, "Who was

it?" He replied, "I do not know, Dad. I do not know his name; he was running for some job. I did not get his name, but he certainly did recommend himself highly." [Laughter.] Let the former Senator tell it, and he is some statesman.

Mr. Smith has a record during his six years' service in another body, at the other end of the Capitol, and I went to the expense—and it cost me \$42—to have it prepared. I find that instead of quoting my record he inadvertently quoted his own, because, lacking a few votes, he missed five out of every six roll calls during his service in Congress. I had Collier's Weekly prepare me a statement of my votes during my service here, and I find that, lacking a few votes, I have been present five times out of every six when the roll in this House has been called. [Applause.]

The former United States Senator says he is a Democrat. I want to say to my brothers in this House that if Mr. Smith is a Democrat I belong either to the Bull Moose or to the regular Republican wing, because I have no place in the Democracy of Smith. [Applause.] A statement is attributed to him that no young man of my race or of my creed could go ahead in politics unless he bowed his head to the Smith yoke. I want to say to you—the membership of this House—that I have been here with you nearly six years and that my head is still on my own shoulders, and I have not bowed to Smith's yoke; and as long as I remain in political life my head will never be bowed to him or to any other political boss—call him James Smith, jr., or H. Otto Witpenn. I remember that in 1896—I was 20 years old at the time—I was out on the street corners talking for Bryan and I saw the ship leave New York that carried Smith away, and I have here a statement which he made before he left—that he could not follow Nebraska's peerless son in his flights of oratory nor could he support the doctrine that he gave out as Democratic principles. I supported Bryan then, as I heartily indorse now his efforts to bring about universal peace. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I will.

Mr. MANN. Smith and Woodrow Wilson were on the same side at that time, I believe? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. That is a fair question, and I am glad my friend brought it up. Woodrow Wilson, as the gentleman well knows, does not claim to be infallible. He is just as human as the gentleman or myself; but I want to say to my friend that before he leaves here he will say, as we Democrats throughout the Nation are now saying, that the man whose Democracy he questions is the greatest President that this country has ever known. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We had an election in our State for governor about 14 years ago. We nominated the former mayor of the city of Newark, James M. Seymour. The Republicans nominated Franklin Murphy, former chairman of the Republican national committee, and when Franklin Murphy was elected governor he said of James Smith, jr., "I owe more to this man than I do to any other man that lives. That is why I am giving him the places that rightfully belong to the Republicans. I have no apology to make for my allegiance to Mr. Smith, because Mr. Smith was loyal to me." And his fight, my colleagues, was made along the lines that The Menace is making in my county against me, only he reversed the order. Smith, like myself, is the member of the faith that The Menace is fighting. He said that Seymour was an A. P. A., and he asked Catholics for that reason to vote against him. I am sorry he fooled some people then, but they are wise to him now, and when he went through the country a few years ago saying to the Catholic hierarchy of the Nation that Woodrow Wilson was an A. P. A. they showed how much credence they placed in that maliciously false statement. And I am proud to say to-day that every member of that faith realizes that in Woodrow Wilson we have an honest, faithful, loyal, patriotic American, and that is all that any race or any creed can ever ask for. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, we had an election last fall. We elected a governor of New Jersey, and the former Democratic United States Senator was on the firing line for Edward Caspar Stokes, the Republican candidate, and the county that the former United States Senator proudly boasts he holds in the hollow of his hand, the good old county of Essex, got away from his moorings and cast its vote for the present governor of New Jersey, a man whose friendship I am proud to claim, a Democrat of the Wilson type, Hon. James Fairman Fielder. My friends, lest there be any doubt as to what I mean when I want to characterize Smith as a traitor to his party, as a man who has commercialized his race and his religion, and a man who has

capitalized his questionable Democracy, I want to say that outside of politics I am a good friend of the genial former United States Senator, and I wish him well. [Laughter.] If I had the time, I might tell of his deal with former Mayor Witpenn to defeat the Wilson candidate for Congress in the eighth district.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that he may have 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are two elements of the party in Newark. Both elements were united upon your candidacy; and I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, if the former United States Senator knew your brand of Democracy, the same as I do, he would have been opposed to your nomination. He does not like Democrats of your type or mine. Another branch of the party is led by James R. Nugent, a relative of former United States Senator Smith, and if it had not been for the malign and baneful influence of Smith Mr. Nugent to-day would be one of the foremost figures in the Democracy of the Nation, because while Smith is a traitor Nugent has always been loyal to his party. I do not think Nugent ever cut a ticket, and I do not think Smith ever voted a ticket without cutting it. That is the difference and distinction between the two men. Nugent does not like me; but I want to be square with him, notwithstanding the fact that there is some personal difference between the two of us. I am not fearful of the effect that this newspaper will have in my county. My friends should remember this, that former Senator Smith is in Essex County, that I have the honor to represent in part, with part of Hudson County. My home is in Hudson County, and this is the only county east of the Mississippi River and north of Mason and Dixon's line that has been consistently carried by the Democratic Party, and I hope to never live to see the day that it leaves that column. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The former United States Senator is reported to have made \$1,000,000 by reason of his activities in the United States Senate when the sugar bill was up. I do not know whether this is true or not; but if it is true, let me say to him that the good God giveth and the good God taketh away; but his millions can never defeat a man whom the people trust. If the people are with a man the bosses are against him, and that accounts for Smith's and Witpenn's opposition to me. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I have ever risen to a question of privilege in this House, and if I were a candidate for reelection to Congress I would not at this time take up the time of the House in discussing this gentleman. But lest my people at home should believe the lying, slanderous utterances of this one-time United States Senator, this great, good, and loyal Democrat, I want to put myself on record where they can see his record and compare it with mine; and I am going to tell you what the people of Hudson County will say after they read this. They are going to say, "It is too bad that Smith was not absent from the United States Senate the other sixth of his time, so that the people of the United States would not have imposed upon them the heavy burdens of sugar taxation, which he and some of his colleagues, knifing the party that honored him, knifing the party that tendered him, in his own language, the best gifts in the State of New Jersey, and brought down on his and their heads that characterization from Grover Cleveland that I thank God will never be brought down on my head by any Democratic or Republican President of the United States."

I do not want my friends to think I am anything other than disappointed in this matter. I have not a bit of venom in my heart, I have not a bit of ill feeling against the former United States Senator. I hope that everything will go along well with him in the leather trade and that everything will go along well with him in the banking business. But I hope that every time he raises his poll in politics there will be enough Wilson Democrats in the State of New Jersey to give it the same bang that it gave his handsome head when he dared to ask the people of New Jersey to send him back to that body at the

other end of this Capitol to again sell out the Democracy and make capital for another 15 years for the Republican Party.

I say I am not sore. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Just a little bit peeved. [Laughter.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mayhap. Still I have nothing against him in the world. [Laughter.] And I hope, my friends, from the bottom of my heart, that this somewhat conservative statement of mine this morning will not influence the former United States Senator to come out and declare for me, because if he does I am afraid I shall be defeated. [Laughter.] I want him to continue his fight. He said I would quit before he does. That is satisfactory to me. If I do, I hope I shall never be elected again to public office.

I repeat that I am not sore, and I mean that I am not sore. I have not a thing in all the world against the former United States Senator; personally he is a genial, likable, warm-hearted gentleman. I believe Kipling was right when he said—

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting, too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or being lied about, don't deal in lies;
Or being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good nor talk too wise;
If you can dream and not make dreams your master;
If you can think and not make thoughts your aim;
If you can meet with Triumph and Disaster,
And treat those two impostors just the same;
If you can bear to hear the truth you've spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools;
If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings, nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!

I leave my future in the hands of the people of Hudson County. My political record has been made. I have voted on every important matter—currency, tariff, direct election of United States Senators. The moving finger having writ, moves on; and to-day I would not change a single vote that I have ever cast, either here or during my service at home. My future may be judged from my past. I have not been perfect, but I have honestly endeavored to represent my people. I have received great honors at their hands. If they see fit to terminate my political career, I can look back on 10 years of honest service and go back into the bosom of my family with my Democracy unquestioned and my honor untarnished, grateful to a loyal constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time. [Prolonged applause.]

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a report (H. Rept. 1124) from the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, by Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland, chairman of the joint committee on the part of the House, and the same was ordered printed.

CORRECTION OF A PENSION BILL.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions and take up for consideration House joint resolution 330. It is simply to correct a mistake in a name in a bill that has been passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Invalid Pensions from the consideration of a House joint resolution, which the Clerk will report, and take it up and pass it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 330) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved April 24, 1914.

Whereas by error in printing the report of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions upon H. R. 10138, approved April 24, 1914 (Private, No. 20), the name of one Joseph F. Barnard, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, was changed to read Joseph F. Isherwood: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the paragraph in H. R. 10138, approved April 24, 1914 (Private, No. 20, 63d Cong.), granting a pension to one Deborah R. Isherwood be corrected and amended so as to read as follows:

"The name of Deborah R. Isherwood, former widow of Joseph F. Barnard, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. We have passed a number of these resolutions, covering, I should suppose, in the neighborhood of a dozen cases, or perhaps more than that, reciting each time an error in printing, which was not true. Now, how did these errors actually occur?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not certain. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], and I do not believe he is able to state whether it was his mistake or the mistake of the clerk or of the committee. If he can, I will ask him to so state to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. He would not know about that. It seems to me, if there are any more of these resolutions, it is only fair to the Clerk of the House and to the Printing Office to stop reciting that the error occurred through an error in printing, when that is not true. To put the House on record as stating that there was an error in printing is to charge it up to somebody as a matter of fault, and the right person is not charged, because I have no doubt whatever that the Printing Office printed these bills, following copy exactly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know where the error occurred, but when a bill is passed and goes to the Pension Department for payment, and they find that it does not correspond with the records of the War Department, they notify our committee, and we ask to make the necessary correction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Russell]?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

SILETZ INDIAN RESERVATION, OREG.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Unanimous consent Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAWLEY. When the House was in Committee of the Whole a week ago for the consideration of bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, it considered H. R. 15803 extensively, and reported it to the House, and after having taken one vote on the previous question, the House adjourned because of the lack of a quorum. Is this bill in order at the present time? The previous question was pending.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill was considered by unanimous consent. The House gave unanimous consent for its consideration. It is undoubtedly the unfinished business to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think it is. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 15803) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the sale of certain lands belonging to the Indians on the Siletz Indian Reservation, in the State of Oregon," approved May 13, 1910.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAWLEY:

"Page 1, line 9, after the words 'section 3' insert the following: 'SEC. 3. That when such lands are surveyed and platted they shall be appraised and sold, except land reserved for water-power sites as provided in section 2 of this act, under the provisions of the revised statutes covering the sale of town sites located on the public domain.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin sends up a motion to recommit. Is the gentleman opposed to this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am opposed to it in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Indian Affairs with instructions to report the same forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the word "act," in line 2, page 2, to the end of the paragraph and insert the following: "In the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, may be paid to or expended for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto in such manner and for such purposes as he may prescribe."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this motion is to have the bill conform to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon moves the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. STAFFORD, there were—ayes 5, noes 57.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The bill was passed.

On motion by Mr. HAWLEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SCHOOL LANDS IN OREGON.

The first business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 49) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national forest land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10848) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892 (27 Stat. L., pp. 52, 53).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that that bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOMESTEAD RIGHTS IN CERTAIN CASES.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15983) to restore homestead rights in certain cases.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who has heretofore made homestead entry of lands embraced in a ceded Indian reservation, and who, in completion of the entry, has paid or shall have paid the purchase price fixed thereon as compensation for the benefit of the Indians, shall be entitled to the benefits of the homestead laws just as though such prior entry had not been made, if otherwise qualified: *Provided,* That the right of commutation of entries under this act shall not be permitted.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "price," strike out the words "fixed thereon as compensation for the benefit of the Indians," and insert in lieu thereof the words "provided in the law opening the land to settlement."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire: If we are to grant to some special class, as provided in this bill, namely, those who happen to have entered upon Indian reservation lands, the right to a second homestead entry, why should not the same privilege be extended to all who have entered upon Government land?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman is aware, a few days ago we did pass a bill restoring the rights of those who lost homesteads on the public domain. This bill restores the homestead rights to those who bought and paid for Indian lands at competitive bids, plus interest, and so forth. I have an amendment which has been drawn after consultation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], which provides that they must have paid more than \$5 an acre. I think with this amendment the gentleman will have no objection. It is as follows:

Add to the end of the bill: *Provided further,* That in the event that the purchase price so paid was less than \$5 an acre this act shall not apply.

So that in no case will any man have a right to file again unless he has paid \$5 or more per acre.

Mr. STAFFORD. It struck me that no person should be given a homestead right after he had availed himself of the privilege once.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the amendment which is to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma I shall have no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say that the person who bought Indian lands—

Mr. MONDELL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wyoming rise?

Mr. MONDELL. To reserve an objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I want to say that the person who bought Indian lands ought not to be deprived of a second home-

stead right for the reason that he was compelled to buy the Indian lands under competitive bids. The land I have in mind is such that all that could be obtained was \$5 an acre or more, and sometimes it run as high as \$20 an acre.

Mr. STAFFORD. A great deal of the Indian lands were sold for less than \$5 an acre, and they should not have a second homestead right.

Mr. FERRIS. They will not get it under the amendment I propose to offer.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I think they should have a second right under the public-land laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why should they after they had availed themselves of the privilege once?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. This is a restricted privilege, a privilege that cost them a great deal of money.

Mr. STAFFORD. But they had the privilege.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. They bought the Indian lands and paid for them in good faith, and settled on them before they could get them, and they should not be deprived of the rights of other American citizens to have a homestead right.

Mr. STAFFORD. They had the privilege once; there was nothing compulsory about compelling them to take the high-priced Indian lands.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is wrong when he says they have exercised their right to the public land. On these Indian lands they had to bid against other men, and in many cases paid high prices.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the privilege of only American citizens, or those who had declared their intention to become such, and they availed themselves of the homestead right. It is only because the price is so fixed that I will not object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the moment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no disposition to object to the consideration of the bill, for I am in favor of it, but I will certainly be tempted to object if we are expected to accept the amendment proposed or suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. There is no logic at all in the amendment he offers. It is true that men who homesteaded Indian lands paid various prices for them. Some paid \$1.25 an acre, and some paid much more; but in every case the price that was paid was supposed to fairly represent the value of the land to the Indian, the value over and above its value as a homestead right. There is no good reason why the man who only paid \$2, \$3, or \$4 an acre should be denied this right which it is proposed to grant to the man who paid more. It is altogether probable that the homesteader who paid more than \$5 an acre did obtain a really valuable piece of land and did secure a valuable piece of property; whereas many men who homesteaded Indian lands and paid from \$1.25 an acre up and less than \$5 for them obtained lands that were of very little value.

Under this proposed amendment practically none of the homesteaders of Indian lands in the Dakotas or the Northwest would secure this benefit. There might be a few gentlemen in Oklahoma, who secured valuable Indian lands, who would be given the right of a second entry.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am in favor of this bill in its present form. I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma to say that he is going to introduce an amendment providing the setting of a certain price which must have been paid for the Indian lands before the homesteader is entitled to the privileges granted by this bill. I believe that is unfair and illogical. If a homesteader has gone on an Indian reservation and has paid \$5 or more an acre for his land, then under the proposed amendment he would be entitled to the privileges granted by this act. But if he goes on an Indian reservation and pays less than \$5 an acre for the land, he would not be entitled to these privileges under the amendment to be proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The fact is that the man who has paid \$5 or more an acre for any of this land has not paid relatively any more, when the real value of the land is considered, than the man who has paid less than \$5 an acre. The man who has paid \$5 an acre or more has secured better land, more valuable land, than the man who has paid less.

The bill in its present form seems to me to be logical, equitable, fair, and just. I am certainly opposed to the bill if it is going to be passed with any amendment fixing a certain price which must have been paid for the land before the privileges of the bill are extended to a homesteader. Such an amendment might satisfy the homesteaders down in Oklahoma, but we can not legislate in that way, and we should not legislate in that way. We should legislate for the whole country and not alone for Oklahoma. We should legislate in cases of this kind for

North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and Montana, and all the public-land States.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from North Dakota both have Indians in their States. They have to come to Congress for many things. I have in my State more than one-third of the Indians of the United States, and I have to come here for many things. I can not get everything as I want it, and you gentlemen can not get everything as you want it. In my State the Government always sells lands at competitive bids. In your Northwestern States you sell them by appraisal, which is a highly preferable way for the investors. In my State every acre of land that is sold is put up at auction, as you would a horse on the street corner, and the people, under the excitement of competition, pay high prices. It was my intention to keep the price question out of this debate, but some gentlemen of the House thought that unless the purchaser paid a good fair price, for instance, \$5 or more, that that person should have no renewal of the homestead right.

Now, let me give the gentleman an example of what a hardship it would work to a certain part of my own home county if this does not pass; it was opened under lottery plan, and they drew lots. Anyone that drew a lucky number took a piece of land at \$1.25 an acre. In the same county under a later act of Congress they put the land up for sale at competitive bids, and it brought fabulous prices. Many paid so much that they never could build a house, never could plow it, and the result is that they have lost the land and lost their money. They need this act very badly. This act will do a great justice to some parties that need relief very badly. I hope the House will pass this bill.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Is it not a fact that in some cases where they bought farming and grazing lands appraised at \$2.50 to \$5 an acre they paid all the land was worth?

Mr. FERRIS. Probably they did. There is much truth in what the gentleman says.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to consideration of the bill, because I believe the gentleman's suggested amendment, if he proposes it, is so unfair that it will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I ought to object to the consideration of this bill, in view of the amendment which the gentleman from Oklahoma has suggested, but I do not feel justified in objecting to a bill simply because some one proposes to limit the effect of the bill, providing they can get votes enough to do so. Therefore, I shall not object, hoping that we can vote down the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] both talk as though they believed that everybody who has had one chance at the public domain ought to have another, regardless of those who have not had any chance. We have opened up a lot of Indian reservations. Thousands of people from my district have gone and endeavored to get a chance to get in on these openings, and they have not succeeded. It was largely done by the lottery system. The men who have succeeded are very well satisfied. They have sold out, and they want to get a chance to get in on another Indian opening. I am not in favor of giving a man a second chance in a lottery, where he has drawn the first prize on the first chance he has had.

Mr. MONDELL. But this second is not a lottery.

Mr. MANN. Certainly it is another Indian opening, and these people entitled to homestead entries will come in just as though they had never been to the first opening, and all of the Indian land that is good has not yet been taken. Unless I can feel quite confident that there is some limitation designed to allow some cases that the gentleman from Oklahoma may have, where people have paid an exorbitant price for poor land, and not allow it to cover every case where a man has had a good chance and taken it, I am not in favor of even letting the bill come up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the word "permitted," insert the words: "Provided further, That in the event the purchase price so paid was less than \$5 per acre this act shall not apply."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will not prevail. I think there is a good deal of equity in the proposition contained in the bill. A man who, in addition to being required to cultivate and improve and live upon his land as must a homestead settler, is called upon to pay for the land is not, in fact, securing the full benefits of the homestead law. At bottom that is the theory of this bill. We propose to give such a man one chance as a homesteader, and yet you do not give him all of the advantages of the ordinary homesteader, because you provide in the bill by a committee amendment that he shall not have the benefit of the commutation clause of the homestead law; so that he must reside upon his land the full period required under the homestead law.

It is entirely inequitable to divide these Indian homesteaders into two classes as is proposed. A man who bought Indian lands for \$5 an acre or \$10 an acre or \$20 an acre might have obtained very much more for his money and for his homestead rights than the man who paid only a dollar and a quarter or two and a half dollars or three and a half dollars an acre. As a matter of fact, the men who have secured really valuable lands as homestead settlers on Indian reservations have been the men who have paid the higher prices—higher prices in some instances by reason of their securing the choicer tracts, higher prices in some cases because of the fertility of the land, because of its accessibility to market, of its favorable conditions and surroundings, but in this amendment you say to a man who paid \$5 an acre in Oklahoma for lands rich and fertile, in a humid region, with good railway transportation, adjacent to markets, "You may make another homestead entry," but to the man who homesteaded in Wyoming or the Dakotas, far from railways, far from markets, on some semiarid lands, of comparatively little value, who paid \$2 or \$3 or \$4, you say, "You have exhausted your rights, and we do not propose to give you any further opportunity as a homestead settler."

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that there may be some basis on which we could divide these Indian claimants so as to allow a second entry to those most entitled to a second entry, but we certainly do not accomplish that by the sort of amendment which is proposed, and I hope and trust the amendment will not be adopted. If the bill is amended as proposed, it would be of no value at all so far as the reservation homesteaders in my State are concerned, because none of them paid as much as \$5 an acre, and yet all paid all that the land was worth. It would not benefit the homestead settlers in Montana, and I refer to Montana because in that great State there have been vast areas of Indian lands opened and sold; and I think none was sold for \$5 an acre or above, or, if so, but a comparatively small area, and it would be unjust and inequitable and unfair to make the distinction between homestead settlers on Indian lands that is proposed in this amendment.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to oppose the amendment, which, I understand, is to make the bill applicable only in cases where the price paid for the land is \$5 an acre or more. Is that correct, I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if this bill has any merit, and I think it has, it ought not to discriminate between those who file upon land where the price is less than \$5 an acre, and, as stated by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], it will operate to do a great injustice to a large number of persons who have just as much right to make a second entry as those who may have paid \$5 per acre, for if an entryman who paid that price is entitled to a second entry, then one who only paid \$4 per acre should also have that right. A strong objection to this amendment is that it will make the bill really applicable almost entirely to settlers on the Kiowa and Comanche Indian Reservations in Oklahoma, though I do not believe the gentleman in offering the amendment had in mind that he was proposing legislation that would apply only within his own State.

Mr. FERRIS. Well, there is some there that sold for \$6 an acre.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say one objection to this amendment, which the gentleman from Wyoming did not propose, and one that ought to defeat it, is the unfair way it would affect settlers in many of the States. In my State we have a law in regard to the disposition of surplus lands within

Indian reservations, and similar laws obtain to lands in Montana and perhaps in North Dakota. The price was fixed under the law in two or three instances I have in mind of lands taken within a period of three months after the proclamation of the President, and the price is fixed at \$6 per acre. All lands taken after three months and before the expiration of six months the price is \$4 per acre and lands filed upon after that \$2.50 per acre. Other cases the law provided for an appraisal, and in my State in one reservation there was a very small portion of land opened to settlement appraised at \$6 an acre, much of it at \$4, and the balance as low as \$2 and \$2.50.

Now, if you adopt this amendment you will have the department, it seems to me, where it is going to be very confusing and difficult to determine who is entitled to make a second entry and who is not. There is not any difference between the man who filed upon the land in Tripp County, S. Dak., for instance, at \$6, or a man who filed three months later and paid \$4. The man who paid \$4 an acre did not get as good land as the man who paid \$6 an acre, and that is true of lands that are appraised, and therefore this amendment ought not to be adopted. I am in accord with what the bill contemplates, and I have no doubt that the gentleman from Oklahoma, in proposing this amendment, had in mind a large number of people who are now upon lands that they have purchased under these acts proposing to sell surplus lands in Indian reservations that are clamoring now for free homes and are petitioning Congress and appealing to the Members who come from those regions to enact legislation to relieve them from paying anything for the lands; and the gentleman, believing as I believe that such legislation is not possible, is now proposing to substitute by this bill something that he believes ought to satisfy that class of people. I hope the bill will pass, but I hope the amendment will be disagreed to, and unless it is rejected I shall not vote for the bill unless it be amended so that it will apply only to lands within the State of Oklahoma. I do not want a law that favors one who may have made an entry in a reservation in my State and does not benefit another who made an entry at the same time in the same reservation, the only difference between them being that one paid \$5 per acre and the other only \$4 per acre.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the theory of this legislation and the reason for it is clearly that the homesteader who has taken land upon an Indian reservation and paid the appraised price for the land has not secured the full benefit of his homestead rights; that he is in a different position from a man who has gone upon the public domain and used his homestead right and secured title to the land without any payment or with a payment of merely the commutation fee. Now, the amendment proposes that the right for a second homestead shall not be granted to a homesteader who has gone upon an Indian reservation and taken up lands on the reservation and has not paid a price of \$5 or more an acre. The provision of the amendment is certainly illogical and unfair. A homesteader who has gone upon an Indian reservation in Montana and paid \$2.50 an acre has paid the full value for the land just as much as the homesteader who has gone upon an Indian reservation in Oklahoma and paid \$6 an acre for the land there. In both cases it is fair to presume that the homesteader in paying the appraised price of the land has paid its full value.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois, in opposition to the bill in its present form, says that a great many of his constituents have been and are now desirous of securing homesteads on these Indian reservations that in the past few years have been opened to settlement. I want to say to the gentleman that to-day in the West there is a large amount of land in Indian reservations that have been open to settlement during the last few years that has not been filed upon, and that if there is any one constituent in his district or 100 or more of his constituents who desire to obtain good farm lands in the West, and who are willing to undergo the hardships of pioneer settlement, I shall take great pleasure in directing them to Indian reservations in North Dakota, South Dakota, and in Montana, where they can secure those homestead lands to-day. Also, in these States they can secure good farm lands on the public domain, where, if they comply with the homestead laws, they will not be obliged to pay anything for the land. Now, if there is a single man anywhere in this country who has not used his homestead right who wants a homestead and is willing to comply with the homestead laws and undergo the trials and troubles attending homesteading, all that is necessary for him to do is to go to one of these Western States and make entry upon some of this fertile, productive, unappropriated land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question, and I ask to be recognized for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON], does the gentleman understand this bill to provide that in case a man has made an entry on a piece of land that was formerly part of an Indian reservation, and paid the price required, completed that entry, secured title, disposed of it, then he could go and enjoy the privilege of a homesteader—still have the right to take another piece of land on the public domain?

Mr. NORTON. I so understand the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I will ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] did he understand the question which I just propounded?

Mr. FERRIS. No. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER. The question is this: Does this give an entryman who has secured a piece of the public domain which once was part of an Indian reservation, and has secured title to it—does this give him the right to go somewhere else and take out a second homestead?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; if he has paid the full Indian price.

Mr. MILLER. On what theory?

Mr. FERRIS. The theory is that he has paid what the land is worth, and the requirement of the homestead feature at all was only to keep down speculation.

Mr. MILLER. In some cases that is entirely true; in other cases not. Has it not been frequently the case that when the price was fixed consideration was given to the fact that the entryman had to live on the land and comply with all the requirements of the homestead law? It is a hardship to live on the land to fulfill these requirements, and this feature ought to be considered.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is a member of the Indian Committee, and he ought to know about this matter better than I. But the gentleman is well aware of the fact that in some parts of the country they put up ceded Indian land at auction and sell it for what it is worth, and sometimes for much more than it is worth.

Mr. MILLER. What the gentleman from Oklahoma has now stated is entirely true. There has been a very great degree of hardship on the part of a lot of men who thought they were getting something that was all right and fair, when as a matter of fact they paid about 10 times too much for their "whistle." So far as that class is concerned, I can see a very good reason for legislation of this character; but this is very sweeping and broad.

Mr. FERRIS. Let me tell the gentleman what happened in my county. The real estate men controlled these new Indian countries when they were first opened. They boomed them up and told every easy mark that came along that the land was worth \$50 an acre, and would grow this or that or the other product, which did not happen, on account of lack of rainfall or other conditions. After making their yearly payments one year after another, when five years have rolled along and they have starved through that period, they have had to mortgage their land to make these Indian payments and pay interest, and then what happens? They sell out their holdings for a few hundred dollars and load a chicken coop and a few of their household goods on a wagon and drive off somewhere else—to New Mexico or Arizona, where there is public land. After a man has lived five years on the land and paid the Indian price, it ought not to exhaust his homestead rights. I think the gentleman from Minnesota will agree with me on that.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with the gentleman as to the merits of the bill respecting the class of people the gentleman has just mentioned, but—

Mr. FERRIS. That is the way it works out.

Mr. MILLER. But that is only a small part. If we had a list of the number of people who have bought lands on Indian reservations, the number would doubtless surprise some gentlemen. If the gentleman will stop for a moment, he will recall that the average price for a long time was \$1.25 an acre, and that is the price now on many Indian reservations as provided by law and treaty.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman is on the Indian Committee, and he knows that in one section of the country it has been the common practice—and I think the correct one, although I did not think so once, but I do now—to put a fixed price on the land, and that appraised price is allowed to govern. But the gentleman knows that down in my State, when the land is disposed of, almost uniformly they put it up at auction and auction it off. Now, to say that there is no distinction between the one case and the other is not quite fair. Of course the gentleman knows that the bill as reported applies to all the States having Indian lands.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota will be interested in knowing what

the precedent is for this legislation. On May 17, 1900, the last free-home law was enacted, and that relieved those who had filed upon homesteads on lands that were formerly within Indian reservations, where they had to pay for their lands the price that was required. It occurred to me that those who had commuted and paid would be asking for some relief, and I introduced a bill that provided that where a person had commuted who otherwise would have been relieved if he had waited and not made proof until after May 17, 1900, he would have a right to make a second homestead entry.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] has a situation in his district, in what was formerly a part of the Kiowa and Comanche Indian Reservation, where the lands were sold at a high price—were sold for more than they were worth—and he is undoubtedly seeking to give some relief to the settlers who are his constituents by passing a bill that will give them the right to make another entry, not believing that it is possible to secure relief from paying the price which they have contracted to pay.

I can not see any difference, really, between the situation in Oklahoma and the situation in other parts of the country where a man has paid \$6, say, in the Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and another man who has paid \$4 because he took land not appraised as high, and therefore not so good; and I can not see why the \$6 man should have the right to make another entry and not the \$4 man.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I ask for an extension of five minutes, in order that these other gentlemen may have an opportunity to express their opinions.

Mr. MONDELL. Some years ago, in my early service in the House, I introduced a bill, which became a law, granting second homesteads to those who had commuted under the homestead law—not Indian homesteaders, but homesteaders generally. Congress passed that act because it was considered that a man who had commuted and paid \$1.25 or \$2.50 an acre for his land had not secured the full benefits of the homestead law. It gave him a second homestead right, but provided that he could not commute that second homestead right.

Now, this bill is drawn on the same theory—that the Indian homesteader has not enjoyed the full benefits of the homestead law; that he ought to be allowed to enjoy the full benefits of the homestead law.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] has referred to a bill which he introduced and succeeded in having Congress adopt, under which we gave some of the Indian homesteaders the benefits of a second homestead. This bill is more general in its provisions.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will say to the gentleman that the cases that were affected by the bill that I introduced and had passed were cases where parties had made proofs after they had lived upon the land long enough to acquire title without paying anything if it had not been that they were required to pay the Indian price. By the act of May 17, 1900, those who had not made proof were relieved. Therefore I thought those who had paid, who would have been entitled to that relief if they had waited until after that date, ought to have something offered to them as a consolation prize, and therefore I introduced a bill that gave them the right to make another homestead entry, but without the right of commutation.

Mr. MONDELL. I voted for the gentleman's bill, and I thought it was a good bill; but this bill is rather more equitable, in that it covers all those cases.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, while I have always felt the utmost sympathy for men engaged in trying to make homes out of the public domain under our laws, I must confess that I do not see the equity or the reasonableness of this particular bill. I appreciate very much the force of what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] says respecting a certain class of entrymen on Indian lands, but their difficulties are not the difficulties of the great mass of entrymen on Indian lands. We are legislating touching a whole group of individuals because of the troubles of a small number of the entire group; and while I shall not indulge in any further remarks on the bill I do want to state here now that I do not believe it is fair or equitable to the general public, and I do not believe it is in the line of wise legislation respecting the public domain. I do not think the homestead laws ought to be cheapened like this. One thing is certain, it seems to me; that is, that a man who had the advantage of going upon the Indian ceded lands to make a home out of 160 acres and failed will never succeed in making a home out of any other 160 acres that you may give him anywhere else in

the United States. He is a failure; so you are not going, in the end, to help him very much. It seems to me it would be nearer equity if we should take the cases of the entrymen cited by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] where the sums paid were altogether too high, and try in some way to alleviate their immediate distress, and give them some benefit, rather than legislate for the entire class of entrymen on Indian lands.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Oklahoma want to make a request in reference to the length of debate on this section and all amendments thereto, this being unanimous consent day?

Mr. FERRIS. I think I will.

Mr. MANN. I would like five minutes myself.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that at the expiration of seven minutes, five minutes of which shall be yielded to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and two minutes to myself on behalf of the committee if I need it, debate close on all amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that debate close on this amendment and all other amendments to the section in seven minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. On this section and all amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois and two to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] will be agreed to. The gentleman from Oklahoma has a peculiar case in his State, and he is seeking to cover that case by general legislation. It may be perfectly proper to provide for the case which the gentleman has in mind, but without the limitation suggested by the amendment offered by the gentleman the bill is wide open all over the United States.

Only a few days ago we agreed to a conference report upon a bill, which I suppose has gone to the President by this time, granting the right to a second or third homestead entry, with certain limitations and restrictions; but if this bill should pass in the form suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURKE], this would grant a second homestead entry without any restrictions whatever where the land was in a ceded reservation. Now, does the gentleman desire to make it easier for somebody in an Indian reservation who has taken a homestead to take a second homestead than for people outside of the Indian reservations in his own State?

These gentlemen agreed the other day to give second homestead entries only within restrictions where people have not sold their rights. That applies to most of the people in the State who have taken homestead entries. I do not think the gentleman now desires to give a preference right, without any restrictions, to those who have taken homesteads in Indian reservations, because in many cases where there has been commutation of homestead entries they have paid just the same outside of the Indian reservation that they have inside of the Indian reservation.

Mr. NORTON rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. MANN. If he desires me to yield for a question.

Mr. NORTON. I was going to ask the gentleman if he did not think it was logical to grant this right to the homesteaders who have paid the appraised price of land included in Indian reservations?

Mr. MANN. I do not think there is any logic in reference to the matter, one way or the other. We are giving a preference right. It is a gratuity which we are presenting to somebody. We have the right to fix the terms upon which we fix this gratuity. Now, if there are some people who, either through competitive bidding or otherwise, have paid an excessively high price for very poor land, as I am informed is the case, it may be perfectly proper that we should give them a second homestead right, without changing the situation as to all the others. These others have the second homestead right now by the bill we passed the other day if they have not sold out their rights.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MANN. For a brief question.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman think it is fair to grant this right to a man on an Indian reservation who has paid \$5 an acre and deny it to a man who has paid \$4.50 an acre for the land?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from North Dakota does not attribute to me the powers of a reasoning being. I am making a speech in favor of the proposition. I will say to the gentleman,

Mr. NORTON. I am glad the gentleman is for the bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman talks about logic. There is no question of logic in the price of the public domain; there is no logic about charging a man \$1.25 an acre when he makes the commutation. We fix the price. It is not a question of logic; it is a question of fixing the price. We fix the prices usually much below the value of the land in the West. We give the people out there the benefit of the public domain, which belongs to the whole country. Having gone in and gotten the benefit of a homestead entry under competitive conditions and under a lottery system, and having made some money out of that, they want to come in and get a chance over again. I think we ought to be careful about giving them a chance the second time.

If they have a hardship in some particular case, very well. We have extended the time of payment time and again on Indian reservations, without objection—by unanimous consent. We have been very fair and very reasonable to most of these people. Undoubtedly they have met with hardship, but I can not see the logic, referring to my friend's question—I can not see the logic of trying to get people on a homestead to sell out, move to some other place, and take up a new homestead. The best thing they can do is to stay where they are and cultivate the land that they have already obtained.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is due, in all frankness, to say that I offered the amendment under consideration after conference with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], but I could not in good conscience say there is not a distinct difference between a man who goes out in the open market to compete, and pays a large and exorbitant price, and those who go and pick out land at an appraised price, which is usually much less than it is worth. I have reported the bill, as it shows, without the amendment, but the gentleman from Illinois suggested the amendment, and I agreed to offer it. I desire to keep full faith with him, and I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRISON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURKE of South Dakota) there were 22 ayes and 7 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "reservation," insert the words "within the State of Oklahoma."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING SITE AT VINELAND, N. J.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16642) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to disregard section 33 of the public buildings act of March 4, 1913, as to site at Vineland, N. J.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to disregard that portion of section 33 of the public buildings act, approved March 4, 1913, which requires that the Federal building site selected at Vineland, N. J., shall be bounded on at least two sides by streets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar. Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill was considered at the last session I sought to obtain some information as to the reason for waiving the general law, which provides that the proposed site shall be bounded on at least two sides by streets. Under the existing law we are aware public buildings must not have any other building nearer than 40 feet on either side. If we waive the provisions of the general law that the site shall not be bounded by at least two streets, why should not we restrict the light and air space of 40 feet on either side of the building?

I would like to ask the gentleman interested in the bill as to the size of the proposed site and the size of the proposed building to be erected on that site, the frontage of the lot on the principal thoroughfare on which it is proposed to erect the public building.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in view of what the gentleman said, which will be found on page 13875 of the Record, it is proper that the House should know about the reasons for the location of the post office as indicated by the bill. The gentleman's conception of what Vineland is is contained in the state-

ment made at that time, but it is so inadequate and mistaken that in justice to him and to the House some facts should be made known. I have some facts here which I will give briefly for the information of the House.

Vineland is located about halfway between Philadelphia and Atlantic City.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is on the old West Jersey Railroad?

Mr. BAKER. Yes; and the Jersey Central road. Both roads pass through the city—30 passenger trains a day. It is a city of 12,000 inhabitants. It has a high school and 20 other schools. It has about 3,000 school children, who are pupils in the schools. It has over 60 teachers in those schools. It has a public library of 10,000 volumes and a circulation of 50,000. It has a historical building. It has factories, and manufactures goods annually to the value of millions of dollars. It is a place of very great importance as a school center. There are located here three public institutions, one for the care of the veteran soldiers, a splendid place established by the Government. Another is a place for the care and training of feeble-minded children; another for feeble-minded women. Vineland is a place that has a great reputation for the public spirit of the city. Its business is such that it is incomparable; it is away beyond places of its size in the activity that there obtains.

Now, as to the post office, the business of the post office this last year was over \$28,000. The business in the money-order department alone was nearly \$200,000, covering some 20,000 different orders issued and orders paid, so that it will give you some idea of the degree and importance of the place for a post office of dimension.

This location is a piece of ground in the center of the city. It has a frontage on the main avenue of 150 feet and a depth of 150 feet, so that it would afford to the building light and air, and on every account is entirely desirable. Every business man there wants it located at that place, because the city is growing and it is central, and it is convenient of access. The trolley line passes by it. The matter of fire protection was spoken of. They have the most complete system of fire protection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House as to whether any other site has been considered for the location of this post office, which would meet the requirements of the general law for a corner lot, bounded by two streets?

Mr. BAKER. One corner was examined by the inspector and he recommended this point, because the corner that he found was outside the line of traffic, in the first instance, and it was out of the center where it ought to be, with relation to the business development of the place. It was not as large, and it would cost more money.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many sites were offered as proposed sites?

Mr. BAKER. Two sites that I have heard of.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman know why the citizens of Vineland are not sufficiently interested in having this public building constructed there so as to have offered for sale to the Government a corner lot? Is property so valuable there that they could not, as in the case of other public buildings throughout the country, provide a corner lot for this Government building?

Mr. BAKER. I know that they are in favor of this site. I do not know that any movement was made to have a site given by the city. I did not know that the Government of the United States was insisting on having that kind of a donation. I know that these people are very enterprising, very public spirited. It is a strong Republican city, for that matter, and they do an immense amount of business. That they should be asked to furnish this Government with a location from which to transact its business is a matter that had not come to my attention. I take it that the Treasury Department, through its agencies, will see to it that the Government is not imposed upon in the acquisition of a proper site.

Mr. NORTON. From this bill it looks as though they were somewhat disgusted with the present administration and desire to put this building off on some inside location, unlike other towns of the country.

Mr. BAKER. I know this, that there are no private interests being served. It is a matter of the public weal that is being considered.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as I understand from the luminous exposition of the matter there were two sites proposed, one on a corner and the other an inside site?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee how far removed from the center of the town is the corner site?

Mr. BAKER. The corner site would be about two squares away from this place and on a side street. My information about that comes entirely from the report of the inspector.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman is not acquainted with the site itself?

Mr. BAKER. I know where it is located. I have passed along the site. I have been in the city.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is not acquainted with the second site proposed for this post office?

Mr. BAKER. I know where the location is. The corner location is smaller, and it has a building upon it, which makes the extra cost in the acquisition of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What are the respective costs of the two sites?

Mr. BAKER. The corner site could be had for \$14,000, and the site that they desire can be had for \$12,000. With what knowledge I have of values I think that price is very low. It was the site of a church, which has been removed within the last year, and those people who owned the church are willing to sell it at the sum of \$12,000, and I know that land next to it has been selling at a rate per foot that would make it worth \$15,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to have some member of the committee, if the gentleman can not furnish me the information, tell us why we should adhere, if we permit this inside tract to be purchased, to the requirement that there should be 40 feet area on either side of the building line. It seems 150 feet frontage on the principal thoroughfare of a city of 6,000 population—

Mr. BAKER. It has twice that population.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is quite considerable.

Mr. BAKER. The ground is desirable. The dimensions are desirable. The place is growing rapidly, and if you were to put a building on the center front of 50 feet, or 80 feet, you would still have 40 feet clear on either side.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was wondering why we should follow that rule, if we are going to abandon the rule which requires the building to be upon a corner lot, or on a lot facing two streets—why should we also insist that there should be 40 feet on each side of free light and air given to the adjoining property owners? Why would not 20 feet on either side, or 15 feet, be sufficient to safeguard the interests of the Government? We are buying an unusual amount of land.

Mr. BAKER. And getting it for less than a less amount of land would cost.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not believe anybody is so charitable, even in the borough of Vineland, as to give the property to the Government below the market price.

Mr. BAKER. I am simply stating the fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the right to object until some member of the committee can furnish me with some information as to why they do not reduce the requirement of law as to the space on either side, if we are going to have an inside lot.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Is it not true that the Government requires a certain space on either side of a public building?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Government requires 40 feet space on each side of the building, and that is predicated upon the idea that it is a corner lot. Here we are departing from that policy and permitting an inside lot to be furnished. It strikes me that in buying land larger than necessary, for the convenience of the adjoining property owners, who may have—

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. It simply means, of course, that we get it at a cheaper price than we can a corner lot.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman recognizes that 150 feet is pretty large; 70 feet will be utilized for the building proper and there will be 40 feet on either side. Of course it will be quite attractive and desirable for the borough of Vineland to have a building located there, for which 100 feet would be ample for public purposes.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. You can not get a corner lot without it being much more expensive. If it is built on a corner, it will be more expensive.

Mr. BAKER. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection. I assume the responsibility, saying that it is in the interest of the Government and the people, and that this ought to be done.

Mr. VALE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BAKER. Yes.

Mr. VARE. Is it not a fact that this land is all in one piece, and certainly the Government would not buy seven-eighths of it?

Mr. STAFFORD. I know my good friend from Philadelphia spends a large part of the time in New Jersey, and the gentleman, undoubtedly, in going to and from Atlantic City, became very well acquainted with this property, and based upon his statement, which corroborates that of the gentleman from New Jersey, who knows at first hand of the conditions, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LONERGAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN MINERAL SPRINGS IN NEW MEXICO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12050) reserving from entry, location, or sale lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, in Sierra County, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That lots 1 and 2, in section 33, township 13 south, range 4 west, New Mexico prime meridian, situated in the county of Sierra, State of New Mexico, be hereby set apart from the public domain and reserved from entry, location, or sale for the purpose of preserving for the use of the public the valuable mineral springs located upon said lots.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to control the use of said lots and the waters thereon, and to make regulations for the government of the reservation, and to make such contracts, agreements, and leases as will best preserve them for the use of the public; and all moneys received from such contracts, agreements, and leases by way of remuneration, or from any other source in connection with this reservation, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a special fund to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of said reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see the latter part of section 2 of the bill provides that any money coming in by way of lease or otherwise shall be paid into the Treasury as a special fund to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Interior for the protection, maintenance, and improvement of said reservation. Well, I am not sure whether Congress can in that way appropriate money which is paid into the Treasury, and hence it might not amount to anything, but does the gentleman think that we should create special funds out of these little matters, or, rather, pay the money into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts so that Congress has control over it when it wishes to appropriate it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will state, as to the first proposition, that the Secretary of the Interior, when petitioned for the building of another hotel or any other expense or enlarging of the springs, digging them out, and making them more available, will have a fund out of which he can pay for those things for this particular work at those springs.

Mr. MANN. Should not the Secretary of the Interior, if he wants to do any work of that sort, receive appropriations from the Congress?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I understand it will take a special appropriation every time there is anything to be done to further improve the springs, while under this proposition, whatever terms he makes with the lessees to put up a hotel, for instance, and distribute the waters through it for use—whatever terms he makes with them, by way of leases, charging a rent, big or little, will be simply for the purpose of further improving the springs as may appear advisable.

Mr. MANN. I suppose this bill was drawn probably in the department, and it ought to have been drawn in proper form. Perhaps it is.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is the Constitution says that no money can be paid out of the Treasury except in pursuance of appropriations made by Congress, so that I doubt whether he can pay this money after it has been paid in; but we have made a rule here in the House for some years not to create special funds to be controlled by any department, but to have the money paid into the Treasury, subject to appropriations by Congress, and recently we extended that even to the Reclama-

tion Service. We did the same thing in reference to the oil wells out West the other day, when the Navy Department claimed oil wells, and we provided that it should be paid in as a fund subject to appropriation by Congress. I am not willing to have Congress reverse itself by unanimous consent unless the gentleman will agree to an amendment covering that proposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would rather agree to an amendment than to have the bill defeated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why not give these springs to New Mexico?—although I do not think they will take them, from the experience we had with the Sulphur Springs.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would rather have the bill passed as it is, and there is some necessity for this provision. These springs are near big mining camps, and they have lately become accessible in this sense. They are near the Elephant Butte Dam and 16 miles from the railroad. There has been built to transport material from the railroad to the dam a magnificent road, and there was also a splendid bridge built across the river at the same time. Up until within two or three years these springs were practically inaccessible, because the river could not be crossed unless at low water, when it could be forded, and therefore they were practically inaccessible. Since it has become accessible people have come there to live in tents and little shacks; but this will encourage the sick people to come in greater numbers, knowing they will get better accommodations. This bill as I have introduced it was first passed on by the Secretary of the Interior, and the sole object of it is not to require the Government to expend money, not even one cent, but to provide a method by which the springs may be self-supporting and, in time, to produce the means for their enlargement and improvement to meet the large demand now existing and that is certain to grow very rapidly as knowledge of their accessibility and conveniences and comforts become more widely known.

Now, with respect to the point made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. To my mind, it is much better for me to have the bill amended as he has suggested than not to get the relief that is really and truly demanded. The cures performed at these springs—and I have known of them for 25 years myself, personally—are mainly cures of poor people, miners, and cowboys, and other people who can not go off to the fine, expensive springs. These springs are close to where they live, in the big mining communities. I would be glad to have them permanently improved, but nobody will put up a building to serve the purposes of the community there unless he gets a lease for a long enough term to justify him in doing it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment granting these tracts to the State of New Mexico, as I suggested some time ago?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I am thoroughly satisfied that that would defeat the bill. I am so advised by Members with much greater experience than mine; and where there are one or two objections now there would be a dozen on this floor and in the other body to such a proposition as that. I am anxious to get this legislation enacted, not to please myself nor to please any particular man who wants to put up a hotel, but because I know of my own knowledge that the poor people are suffering from lack of use of these springs.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do.

Mr. GOULDEN. What are the medicinal qualities of this water? I heard the gentleman mention that they were curative. What are they good for?

Mr. FERGUSON. For rheumatism and other diseases of the blood.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I hope in view of the general conditions confronting the House, while we are opening up a general sanitarium of this kind, no one will object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, anyone familiar with the situation that has developed at Hot Springs, Ark., would be unwilling that the Government should enter further upon such a process. I suggest to the gentleman that he allow his bill to go over for the present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has an amendment, will he let me know the purport of it? If the gentleman demands that it go over, I will be willing to have that done. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN ACCOUNTS UNDER THE RECLAMATION ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 124) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle certain accounts under the reclamation acts, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OVER LABOR DAY.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns next Saturday, the 5th of September, it adjourn over Labor Day to meet the following Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns next Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday following.

Mr. MANN. Why not make it Friday?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Well, I will make it Friday. I will modify my request, Mr. Speaker, and ask that when the House adjourns Friday it adjourn to meet on the following Tuesday, September 8.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois amends his request and asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn next Friday it be to meet on Tuesday following. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects. Does the gentleman object to the modification or to the original request?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object to both propositions.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

OIL OR GAS LANDS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15661) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease to the occupants thereof certain unpatented lands on which oil or gas has been discovered.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon relinquishment or surrender to the United States, within six months from the date of this act, by any locator or his successors in interest of his or their claim to any unpatented oil or gas lands included in an order of withdrawal, upon which oil or gas had been discovered, was being produced, or upon which drilling operations were in actual progress January 1, 1914, and the claim to which land was initiated prior to July 3, 1910, the Secretary of the Interior shall lease to such locator or his successors in interest the said lands so relinquished, not exceeding, however, the maximum area of 2,560 acres to any one person, association, or corporation, said leases to be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of not exceeding one-eighth of the oil or gas extracted or produced from the leased premises or the proceeds thereof, each lease to be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for succeeding periods of 10 years, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts, and make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect, and all leases or assignments of leases shall be subject to such rules and regulations, and the failure of any lessee or of his successor or successors to comply with the terms and conditions of the lease shall work a forfeiture of the same, to be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 1, 2, and 3, strike out the word "shall," in line 1, and insert "may in his discretion."

In line 2, page 2, after the word "lease," insert the words "on such reasonable terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "two thousand five hundred and sixty" and insert "six hundred and forty."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not object. Is it the thought of the gentleman from Illinois that this matter can be disposed of when we reach the general leasing bill?

Mr. FOSTER. It is hoped that it might be.

Mr. MONDELL. The difficulty is that the general leasing bill will not come up for some days, and in all probability will not become a law at this session.

The situation is this, speaking now only of my own State: There are a few—not many—oil-land claimants who believe

they are entitled to their lands, but rather than continue long-drawn-out contests with the Government they would be willing to take a lease and surrender their claim to a title. While the matter is pending they do not feel like going on with their drilling operations and developing the property. They fear that that might result in large expenditures for which they would secure nothing if the decision is finally against them.

If we were going to dispose of the general leasing bill immediately and could take care of the matter in that way, that would be entirely satisfactory, but I think that is impossible. I think it is generally understood that the general leasing bill will not become a law at this session, and the matter therefore will go over for some time. Meanwhile there are these parties anxious to develop the wells, and the country is anxious to get the product, but they can not develop their wells under the present conditions.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is it provided in this bill that the royalties shall not exceed one-eighth?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I had nothing to do with the fixing of the royalty, but it occurs to me as being entirely proper, because that is almost the universal oil royalty.

Mr. FOSTER. That is probably so in most instances, but yet I do not see why it should be said in a bill, that they shall lease it at not to exceed that, and fix a maximum which can never be exceeded.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think that is altogether a vital matter; but speaking on that particular point, it does seem to me that it is better for Congress to determine what is to be done than to leave it to the discretion of some official.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is another provision here. The committee have stricken out 2,560 acres and have inserted 640 acres. Is the gentleman in favor of that amendment?

Mr. MONDELL. The committee has reduced the area.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. That is not entirely satisfactory to me; but I doubt if there are many people in my State who own more than that acreage that they would desire to bring within this act. I am not informed there are; I have heard no complaint or protest against that provision.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe there are many oil leases that cover even 640 acres. If there is really oil in the ground, I should think that 640 acres would be a large lease.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman understand that quite frequently men have gone upon land, or are claiming land, only a small portion of which contains oil in any considerable quantity?

Mr. FOSTER. I know that. I live in an oil country.

Mr. MONDELL. Sometimes a man must have quite a considerable acreage in order to have any substantial amount of product.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true. Sometimes a man has a large acreage and no product.

Mr. MONDELL. That has been my experience.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that fixing a maximum beyond which they could not go, of one-eighth of the oil, is unwise. A good lease might be worth a good deal more. The gentleman knows that. Some leases call for one-sixth of the oil, and others for one-eighth.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not know of any private leases anywhere that call for more than one-eighth, and many of them less.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; it depends on the amount produced from each well each day. That might govern the amount that might be exacted as a royalty.

Mr. MONDELL. I will say to the gentleman that while I believe Congress ought to fix the royalty, and I hope that in the leasing bill it will do so, still in order to relieve these cases I do not think that provision is absolutely essential, although I think it is a sound provision.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is important that a bill of this kind should be passed whereby this Government land may be developed, because if there is private oil land around it that is being developed, unless the Government land is developed, probably there will not be any oil left in it.

Mr. MONDELL. In my State there are not many of these cases, but there are some in a field that is being developed, where this additional development is needed, but where the parties do not feel justified in making improvements and sinking more wells, because of the uncertainty of finally securing title. They would be willing to accept a lease in lieu of title because of that uncertainty.

Mr. FOSTER. If they are there for the purpose of securing the oil, a lease is all they want. It does not matter whether they get title to the ground or not.

Mr. MONDELL. No; this particular ground has no value except for oil.

Mr. FOSTER. In any other case, if they are there simply to get the oil out, they may not want to buy the land.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to the number of acres of land in his State that are now in contest to which this bill is applicable?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not pretend to know, but I doubt if there are over a score or so of entrymen, perhaps, claiming from 160 acres upward, who would want to come under the act; possibly a very few.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are some contests now pending before the Land Commissioner, or in the courts, as to the title to the oil lands, are there?

Mr. MONDELL. No; not in the courts. There are applications that have been made for patents and the department has not decided them. I will say to the gentleman that there are some cases where the question involved is as to the force and effect of what is known as the Roosevelt withdrawals, and as to whether these parties were actually in possession and drilling at the time of the congressional withdrawals, and the department seems to be slow in deciding those questions. The Federal courts have held that the original withdrawal was of no force or effect, and the Supreme Court has not passed upon it. There are not many cases, but it happens that those few cases are in a developing field, and they are willing to accept a lease rather than wait for the title under the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think that in place of saying that the royalty shall be not to exceed one-eighth, the matter should be left to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MONDELL. No; my opinion is that we should say not more than one-tenth; but as the bill says not more than one-eighth I am content to leave it that way. I think that in all these cases that would be the better thing to do. That is my personal opinion. There is ground for difference of opinion, as I realize.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am individually concerned, I have never seen a lease which called for a royalty of less than one-eighth, and they have exceeded that. One-eighth is the least amount that has usually been asked.

Mr. MONDELL. One-tenth is, I think, a frequent lease in my State.

Mr. FOSTER. I have never come across such a lease.

Mr. MONDELL. There are quite a number of them that are one-eighth. I know of none more than that.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. What is the royalty provided in the leasing bill that is come before the House?

Mr. RAKER. It does not fix any. It is left to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. What objection is there to putting that provision in this bill, leaving it to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MONDELL. There is this difference: In these cases a man is actually giving up a claim which in the majority of cases he thinks is an excellent one, to land on which he is spending a great deal of money, and he feels that if he is going to surrender his right to a patent, he ought to know pretty definitely what he is going to receive. I think that even if we do not prescribe the royalty or fix the royalty in the general bill, that where you are proposing as in this case that a man shall surrender his claim to a patent, he ought to know what sort of a bargain he is going to make.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman is right; but I think the Secretary of the Interior ought to fix that and not to make it a minimum of one-eighth.

Mr. MONDELL. We would hope that the Secretary would make it about the ordinary lease, which is one-eighth, and allow the man to surrender his rights.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know about that.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose he does not surrender?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is fair that the Secretary should fix the lease. You might in some cases not want to pay one-eighth, and in other cases it might be right to pay a larger royalty. I think the Secretary of the Interior ought to have the right to fix the royalty.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not agree with the gentleman on the royalty proposition either in this case or generally, but in this class of cases you are asking a man to surrender property rights.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe we do that where we give him a great deal of land, where we offer him 640 acres of ground, which is a large lease.

Mr. MONDELL. That depends upon how much oil there is under it.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the gentleman will offer the amendment. I would like to reduce the amount of land.

Mr. RAKER. I think the Secretary of the Interior should fix the price for it. The people of California are perfectly willing to let the Secretary of the Interior fix the royalty.

Mr. MONDELL. They must be very liberal folks out there. Mr. RAKER. Well, when you get squeezed you have to be liberal.

Mr. MONDELL. When you are squeezed by a decision of the department and want to get out you are willing to take anything. Is that the idea?

Mr. RAKER. Well, let us pay the Government something.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object. We have discussed the bill seven or eight times and wasted too much time.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 7967. An act to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a postal savings system; and

H. R. 1657. An act providing for second homestead and desert-land entries.

ALCATRAZ ISLAND.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9017) transferring the control and jurisdiction of Alcatraz Island and its buildings thereon from the Department of War to the Department of Labor.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, in regard to this bill there are some matters to be adjusted, and I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC-BUILDING SITE, PLYMOUTH, MASS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 16820, to provide for enlarging the site for the United States building at Plymouth, Mass.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise all the land in the old William Brewster plat still owned by private parties and contiguous to the public-building site now owned by the United States at Plymouth, Mass., and that the total cost of such extension and improvement shall not exceed the sum of \$12,000: *Provided*, That if the land described shall be obtained for less than the amount authorized, the remainder may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury in grading and otherwise improving the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts one or two questions. Two years ago we passed a bill which, I think, the gentleman from Massachusetts introduced—

Mr. TIACHER. I did not have the honor to be in the House at that time.

Mr. MANN. That was a loss to the House, whoever the gentleman succeeded. We passed a bill authorizing the sale of the Federal post-office site, or a portion of it, at Plymouth for \$100. I believe the sale was not consummated, although the law was passed. I have a plat which has been furnished to me by the Treasury Department purporting to give the boundaries of the land which we authorized to be sold for \$100, and the land which this bill proposes to acquire for \$12,000. Now, gentlemen can see the amount of land that was to be sold for \$100, and without widening my fingers much on this plat, this much is to be acquired for \$12,000. There is little difference in the areas. It looks like a marked difference in the values of the land.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. If the committee had had filed a copy of that plat with the report, all the Members of the House could have seen it, and there would have been no question but that the facts would have been plain.

Mr. MANN. They could not have filed this plat, for they did not have it, and I do not think they had any other. They did

not even know that we had authorized the sale two years ago. The committee did not discover that fact, apparently.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman says the sale was made two years ago?

Mr. MANN. We passed the law two years ago in May authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell a piece of this site for \$100, on the ground that we did not need it. I am informed by the Treasury Department that the sale was not consummated, for the grantee refused to take it. Now we are asked to pay \$12,000 for the piece of land adjoining the other, substantially no larger, on the ground that the site is not large enough. I am asking for information.

Mr. FOSTER. It looks to me as though the people of Plymouth were very enterprising.

Mr. MANN. Nobody ever accused the New England people of not being bright.

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will be frank with the gentlemen. I do not recall the vote by which the sale of the land was authorized for \$100.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt it was done by unanimous consent.

Mr. THACHER. I was not in the House at the time, and I do not know what land the gentleman refers to.

Mr. MANN. I could not tell from the description of the land in the law as to what land was referred to, and hence I wrote the Treasury Department this letter:

Hon. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Sir: There is pending in the House H. R. 16829, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase lands or rights contiguous to the public-building site now owned at Plymouth, Mass. By the act of May 27, 1912, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to sell to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth that portion of the Burns lot included in the Federal building site in said city to the south of the continuation of the southerly boundary line of the next adjacent property conveyed to the United States by said First Baptist Church. I beg to ask whether the property so sold was a part of the present building site at Plymouth, which it is proposed by H. R. 16829 to now enlarge; and if so, to ask, if you can conveniently do so, that you may send me a rough pencil draft of the site, showing the land sold and the land proposed to be purchased.

Yours, very respectfully,

I received this letter from a very estimable gentleman, formerly a colleague of ours, whom we all love and admire, Mr. Andrew J. Peters, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 29, 1914.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives.

Sir: In response to your letter of the 24th instant, I inclose a blue print showing the Federal building site at Plymouth, Mass. The land embraced within the yellow lines is the portion of the site which was proposed to be sold to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth pursuant to the act of Congress approved May 27, 1912. The sale, however, was never made, the Baptist Church people finally deciding that they did not desire to acquire the land.

The land embraced within the red lines is the property which is the subject of bill H. R. 16829, to which you refer. As will be seen, it is not a part of the land which was proposed to be sold by the act of May 27, 1912, hereinabove referred to.

Respectfully,

A. J. PETERS,
Assistant Secretary.

I have here in my hand the plat, with the red and the yellow lines. The yellow lines inclose a space not quite so large as the red lines, the two pieces adjoining, the red-line space being on the street, apparently, and the yellow line back. One we offered to sell for \$100, and the other it is proposed that we pay \$12,000 to buy, although I have been informed, and I will ask the gentleman whether that is correct, that the assessed valuation of this twelve-thousand piece in Plymouth is less than \$2,000?

Mr. THACHER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I believe that he is mistaken about the valuation. I shall be very glad to give him the information. There has been no inflation in the value of that land. The corner which the Government now owns is on the corner of Main and Leyden Streets, and it is proposed to acquire adjacent land on the northerly side of Main Street, which piece of property was sold about a year and a half ago for \$7,000, and I understand that it has recently been sold for \$9,000, and there is no hocus-pocus about this matter at all. The values are there and the property has been enhanced very materially. As I stated before, I think the Government made a mistake when they did not acquire all of the land, and I think if the gentleman would go to Plymouth—and I hope to have the honor of seeing him there some day—he would vote for this proposition.

Mr. MANN. But if the House two years ago voted for a bill authorizing the sale of a considerable portion of this land, upon the ground that we did not need it, what emergency has arisen since then which compels us not only to use the land that we have already gotten, but also the land that we agreed to sell, and a large amount in addition to that?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts permit an interruption?

Mr. THACHER. Yes.

Mr. BOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent to have this bill go over without prejudice. The reason—make that suggestion is that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is interested in having some further information in respect to this, and unless he desires to make the request I shall make it myself.

Mr. THACHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2337) to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. HAY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. HAY. I reserve the objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; I will not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland objects and sticks to it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Fairchild	Kless, Pa.	Ragsdale
Alken	Faison	Kindel	Rainey
Ainey	Farr	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Riordan
Ansberry	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Rothermel
Aswell	Finley	Korby	Sabath
Austin	Fitzgerald	Lafferty	Scully
Bartholdt	Fowler	Langham	Seldomridge
Bartlett	Gardner	L'Engle	Sells
Bathrick	Garrett, Tex.	Lenroot	Shackelford
Bell, Ga.	George	Levy	Sherley
Brown, N. Y.	Gillett	Lewis, Pa.	Sinnott
Browne, Wis.	Goeke	Lindquist	Slemp
Browning	Goldfogle	Loft	Smith, Minn.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gordon	Logue	Smith, N. Y.
Burke, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	McGillcuddy	Steenerson
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Stevens, N. H.
Calder	Griest	McLaughlin	Stringer
Cantor	Guernsey	Mahan	Switzer
Cantrill	Hardwick	Maher	Townsend
Carew	Hart	Manahan	Treadway
Chandler, N. Y.	Hayes	Martin	Tuttle
Church	Helvering	Merritt	Underhill
Clark, Fla.	Hensley	Montague	Vaughan
Coady	Hill	Moore	Vollmer
Covington	Hinds	Morin	Wallin
Crisp	Hobson	Mott	Watkins
Dixon	Howard	Murdock	Weaver
Doolling	Hoxworth	Neeley, Kans.	Whitacre
Eagle	Hullings	Oglesby	Williams
Edmonds	Hull	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, N. Y.
Elder	Jones	Palmer	Woodruff
Esch	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	
Estopinal	Kent	Powers	
Evans	Key, Ohio	Prouty	

The SPEAKER. On this call 297 Members—a quorum—have responded to their names.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

BRIDGE ACROSS PISTAKEE AND NIPPERSINK LAKES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17267) to authorize Frank A. Gardiner to construct a bridge across the waters of Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake at or near their point of intersection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Frank A. Gardiner and his assigns be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the waters of Piskatee Lake and Nippersink Lake at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near their point of intersection, in the county of Lake, in the State of Illinois, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill authorizes the construction of a bridge over an exclusively interior lake. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee wherein is there any jurisdiction in the National Government to authorize such construction?

Mr. MANN. Oh, this is navigable water.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are plenty of interior lakes in Wisconsin which are navigable and which are not subject to the jurisdiction of the National Government because they are navigable.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THOMSON] to make such explanation as he desires about the bill.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is navigable water, and it is an interstate stream, which connects with rivers that go up in the State of Wisconsin, and it is necessary to have the approval of the Federal Government to have such a bill as this passed in order that this bridge may be built.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain wherein the National Government has any authority over the waters of this lake?

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Why, the waters of this lake are connected up with streams that are interstate in character.

Mr. ADAMSON. If the gentleman will permit, the United States Government has jurisdiction over all navigable waters. There is a provision in the river and harbor act of 1899 which dispenses with the necessity of coming to Congress with a special bill, but it does not prohibit the coming to Congress with a special bill at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman's contention to be that a lake exclusively within the confines of a State which has navigable waters gives jurisdiction to the National Government over those waters?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not understand it is necessary to answer that question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood just now that the gentleman made that as a postulate.

Mr. ADAMSON. No; I said that where the stream is navigable within a State it is not absolutely necessary to come to Congress, but it is not prohibited, and I understand that this water is connected with other waters that are navigable.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can hardly conceive of any water in the United States, even though it may be a jerkwater stream, that is not in some way connected with navigable waters. This bridge proposes to go over navigable waters of a lake that is exclusively within the confines of a State. I never knew the National Government had jurisdiction over such waters, but I have no objection to this bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. The language of the river and harbor act of 1899, section 9, renders it unnecessary to come to Congress, but it does not prohibit the coming to Congress; and in this case the Secretary of War approved the project without even a suggestion that it is not necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is another bill reported from the gentleman's committee in which the Secretary of War states that he sees no reason whatsoever for the National Government taking jurisdiction even of a stream which is connected with navigable waters which are entirely within the confines of a State.

Mr. ADAMSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the Secretary of War says in the other case that he sees no actual necessity for it—not any reason for it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, are amendments in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend to correct the spelling of the last word in the fifth line to conform with the spelling as printed in the title. It should be spelled P-i-s-t-a-k-e-e.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by changing the initial "A," in line 3, to the initial "H."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, change the initial "A" to the initial "H."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, the title ought to be amended to correspond to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to correspond to the text.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON HOME EDUCATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11179) authorizing the Secretary of State to extend invitations to foreign countries to send delegates to the Fourth International Congress on Home Education.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a Senate bill exactly similar to this bill has passed the House and become a law. I ask that this bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves to lay the bill on the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS BLACK RIVER, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17511) to authorize the Great Western Land Co., of Missouri, to construct a bridge across Black River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Great Western Land Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Black River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the northwest quarter of section 5, township 22 north, range 7 east, of the fifth principal meridian, in the county of Butler, in the State of Missouri, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN PENNSYLVANIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17442) to amend section 103 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1913, and June 6, 1914.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 103 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, as amended by the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1913, and June 6, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 103. That the State of Pennsylvania is divided into three judicial districts, to be known as the eastern, middle, and western districts of Pennsylvania. The eastern district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Berks, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Lancaster, Lehigh, Montgomery, Northampton, Philadelphia, and Schuylkill. Terms of the district court shall be held at Philadelphia on the second Mondays in March and June, the third Monday in September, and the second Monday in December, each term to continue until the succeeding term begins. The middle district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Adams, Bradford, Cameron, Carbon, Center, Clinton, Columbia, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Fulton, Huntingdon, Juniata, Lackawanna, Lebanon, Luzerne, Lycoming, Mifflin, Monroe, Montour, Northumberland, Perry, Pike, Potter, Snyder, Sullivan, Susquehanna, Tioga, Union, Wayne, Wyoming, and York. Terms of the district court shall be held at Scranton on the second Monday in March and the third Monday in October; at Harrisburg on the first Mondays in May and December; at Sunbury on the second Monday in January; and at Williamsport on the first Monday in June. The clerk of the court for the middle district shall maintain an office, in charge of himself or a deputy, at Harrisburg; the civil suits instituted at that place shall be tried there, if either party resides nearest that place of holding court, unless by consent of parties they are removed to another place for trial. The western district shall include the territory embraced on the 1st day of July, 1910, in the counties of Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Bedford, Blair, Butler, Cambria, Clarion, Clearfield, Crawford, Elk, Erie, Fayette, Forest, Greene, Indiana, Jefferson, Lawrence, McKean, Mercer, Somerset, Venango, Warren, Washington, and Westmoreland. Terms of the district court shall be held at Pittsburgh on the first Monday of May and the second Monday of November, and terms of the court shall be held at Erie on the third Monday of March and the third Monday of September. The clerk and marshal of said district shall have

their principal offices at Pittsburgh, and shall maintain, by themselves or by their deputies, offices at Erie.

"The clerk shall place all cases in which the defendants reside in the counties of said district nearest Erie upon the trial list for trial at Erie, where the same shall be tried, unless the parties thereto stipulate that the same may be tried at Pittsburgh."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the purpose of this amendment is to tide over the meeting of the court in the city of Pittsburgh beyond election?

Mr. WEBB. That might be stated as correct.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I am not mistaken, the election is on the first Tuesday following the first Monday. If such is the case, is it not possible for the second Monday to occur on the day preceding the election?

Mr. WEBB. It might appear that way. It is very rare.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have a case in mind. Our primaries in Wisconsin are held on the first Tuesday in September. Usually Labor Day precedes. This year it just happens that the first Tuesday of September occurs to-day, and the primaries are being held. If it is the purpose to avoid the election difficulty, I would say the second Monday in November does not overcome that in all cases.

Mr. WEBB. In answer to that I can only say that the attorneys, the judge, and all the court officials are anxious that this change be made. It is purely a local matter, and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] represents this district and is anxious to have the bill pass, and the committee thought it best to grant the request.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill permits that it may happen on some rare occasion.

Mr. WEBB. It may in some rare instances, but it is very rare when it comes as late as the second Monday in November.

Mr. STAFFORD. It will not occur as frequently as the second Monday in November, but it will occur. To make it the second Wednesday would make it safe under all conditions.

Mr. WEBB. It is usual to provide Mondays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WEBB, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IOWA INDIANS OF OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was H. Res. 554, referring the bill (H. R. 17441) for the relief of the Iowa Indians of Oklahoma to the Court of Claims for a finding of fact and conclusions of law.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 16618) for the relief of the Iowa Indians of Oklahoma, with the accompanying papers, be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for a finding of fact and conclusions of law, under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary."

Also the following committee amendment was read:

In line 1 strike out the figures "16618" and insert "17441."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of the bill whether it is his purpose to refer the bill H. R. 17441 to the Court of Claims or whether he wishes to refer the matters comprised in the bill to the Court of Claims?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It is a bill for a finding of fact.

Mr. STAFFORD. The resolution reads that you wish to refer the bill H. R. 17441, with the accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims for finding of fact under the provisions of the general law. There is nothing for the Court of Claims to find out so far as that bill is concerned.

Mr. MANN. The law provides for that. It provides for referring the bill and provides for what the Court of Claims will find.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman wants the Court of Claims to find on the bill itself?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want them to give a finding of fact under the general law on the matter comprised in the bill.

Mr. MANN. All we refer is the bill and accompanying papers. The law directs what the Court of Claims shall do.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire whether it is the purpose to give these people the right of appeal to the Supreme Court, as provided in text of the bill H. R. 17441?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That is practically it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe it is not, from what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says.

Mr. MANN. Certainly not. The court makes a finding of fact and reports back to Congress, just like it does on all these war claims we have.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman from Oklahoma was in error as to the purport of the provisions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

LIMESTONE DEPOSITS, TUSCARORA NATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14196) authorizing the Tuscarora Nation of New York Indians to lease or sell the limestone deposits upon their reservation.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Tuscarora Nation of New York Indians, by their chiefs in council assembled, are hereby authorized and empowered to lease or sell for the benefit of the nation all or a part of the limestone deposits upon their reservation in one or more suitable tracts: *Provided*, That before such lease or sale shall be made notice of intention to lease or sell, giving a general description of the lands upon which said limestone deposits are located, shall be published in two papers, one issued in the county of Niagara, State of New York, and one issued in the city of Buffalo, county of Erie, State of New York, once a week for three consecutive weeks; said notice shall state the time and place when sealed bids shall be received for the mentioned tracts, and such lease or sale shall be to the highest responsible bidder: *Provided further*, That before any lease or sale shall be made the terms of the proposed contract shall be fully explained to the entire nation and shall be approved by a majority of the votes of the whole people of voting age, but before any lease or sale shall become effective it shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for his approval as to the sufficiency of the amount of the consideration and terms of payment, and if approved by him, the chiefs are hereby authorized and empowered to enter into such lease or sale. All moneys paid upon any lease or sale made as herein provided shall be paid to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall distribute the same among the adult persons, and thereafter to the minor persons as they attain their majority, entitled to participate in the distribution of the consideration, without any fee, expense, or charge against the nation or any of its people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that I have a committee amendment which I wish to present in the event that the bill is considered at this time. The amendment is in this language—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The amendment proposed by the committee is as follows:

At the end of line 19, page 2, add: "*Provided further*, That the money so deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the minors of said nation shall draw 3 per cent interest per annum; and the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, upon satisfactory proof, withdraw from the Treasury any part of the sum so deposited to the credit of any minor for the purpose of education or actual maintenance of said minor."

With this amendment we ask that the bill be enacted into law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice from the report that the value involved in this proposition is a million and a half dollars. Does the gentleman believe that we should pass under unanimous consent a bill involving such a large amount as that?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. We think, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the best guarded bills that has ever been brought before this House, for the reason that the Indians are of voting age, and they are voters in that State, as I understand it, and are required to pass upon this proposition by a referendum vote, which has to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. After the chiefs make the lease the Indians must pass upon that by a referendum vote, and the Secretary of the Interior must approve of that lease before it becomes active.

Mr. STAFFORD. In reply to the position just stated by the gentleman from Texas, I wish to ask whether in the last Congress there was not a proposition before the House, or before

the committee, which was far less favorable to the Indians and yet which had been approved by a majority of them?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I do not remember the exact terms of that bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that the Indians approved of a proposition to lease this property to the Carroll brothers on much less favorable terms than is expected to be?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I yield for an answer to that to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLANCY], who is more familiar with this matter than I am.

Mr. CLANCY. So far as I remember that bill, it was less favorable to the Indians, but I do not believe it was approved by the tribe, but only by the council. We require that the negotiations conducted by the council shall be approved by a referendum vote of the entire tribe.

Mr. STAFFORD. That referendum would be only of the majority of the tribe, would it not?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe there are only some four hundred and odd Indians remaining of the tribe?

Mr. CLANCY. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are allottees, are they not?

Mr. CLANCY. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. They have not separated themselves from the tribal government?

Mr. CLANCY. No. Eleven chiefs are elected exclusively by the ballot of the squaws. The males have nothing to do with this business unless they are elected chiefs by the squaws.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have an illustration of where women are absolutely supreme, where the squaws elect the chiefs. That is an extremely interesting case of woman suffrage.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman does not compare the American women with the Indian squaws, does he?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I have not the full acquaintance with the Indian squaw that the gentleman from California may have, but I believe they stand very favorably as compared with the Indian men. I believe that there is not much difference between the Indian man and the Indian woman, and the Indian women have more burdens to bear than the Indian men.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, I do not think the gentleman should compare the voting women of America with Indian squaws. We all are proud of the American woman.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] will admit that these Indian women in New York have been progressive enough to get the voting privilege long ahead of even the women of California, and they have not only gotten the voting privilege themselves, but they have already deprived the men of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Oh, that is all right.

Mr. MANN. If that is not progressive, then I do not know what is.

Mr. RAKER. The word "progressive" was used by the gentleman in a derisive way.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. Nobody used it in a derisive way except the gentleman from California, who is always deriding woman suffrage. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAKER. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he is not deriding it, he is riding it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I may have added an extra syllable—that is all. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 19, page 2, add:

"Provided further, The money so deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the minors of said nation shall draw 3 per cent interest per annum; and the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, upon satisfactory proof, withdraw from the Treasury any part of the sum so deposited to the credit of any minor for the purpose of education or actual maintenance of said minor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AT LOS ANGELES, CAL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 494) to establish a branch hydrographic office at Los Angeles, Cal.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

AMENDMENT OF THE JUDICIARY CODE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17147) to amend section 195 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill lie on the table, a similar Senate bill having passed the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the bill lie on the table. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF SEA-FISHERY INDUSTRIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) authorizing the President to accept the invitation to participate in an international exposition of sea-fishery industries.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and is hereby, authorized to accept an invitation extended by the Government of France to that of the United States to be represented by a delegate at an international exposition of sea fisheries, to be held at Boulogne-sur-Mer, June 15 to October 1, 1914: Provided, That no appropriation shall be granted at any time for expenses of delegates or for other expenses incurred in connection with said Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. MANN. When is this exposition to be really held?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Some time between June and October.

Mr. MANN. I see the joint resolution covers a period of time from June to October 1.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is it going to be held at all?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think it is being held. The purpose of the administration was to appoint a delegate to this conference, who was already in Denmark to attend another conference, expecting him to devote a small part of his time to this duty.

The Secretary of State recommended the passage of this resolution in the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 4, 1914.

The PRESIDENT:

On February 25, 1914, the ambassador of the French Republic at this Capital, by order of his Government, extended to the Government of the United States an invitation to participate in an international exposition of sea-fishery industries to be held at Boulogne-sur-Mer from the 15th of June to the 1st of October of the present year, and to be officially represented therein by a delegate.

The Department of Commerce, to which this invitation was referred, has advised me that the exposition will doubtless contain features of great practical value to the United States, and that there should be a critical examination of the exhibits from the viewpoint of the American fishery interests, and has recommended that this Government take advantage of the presence of an official representative of this Government at the annual conference of the International Council for the Study of the Sea, to be held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in September next, for which provision has been made by Congress, and that this representative be made a delegate to the International Exposition of Sea Fishery Industries, with authority to devote a limited amount of time thereto. The Department of Commerce states that no special appropriation will be required for this purpose.

The Executive being precluded by a provision of the deficiency act approved March 4, 1913, from accepting an invitation of this nature without specific authority of law, I have the honor to submit the matter herewith, to the end that should you approve thereof it may be transmitted to Congress for that body to determine whether it will authorize the acceptance of the invitation.

Respectfully submitted.

W. J. BRYAN.

Mr. MANN. Will he be able to attend now?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I could not answer that.

Mr. MANN. Anybody already in Europe has probably gotten out by this time, or is making great effort to get out.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I think the delegate to the Copenhagen conference is in Europe.

Mr. MANN. He has my sympathy.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There is no war where this conference is being held, and it is possible he may be able to get to the exposition of sea fisheries in Paris.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LA JUNTA, COLO.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12665) to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at La Junta, Colo., be, and the same is hereby, increased \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to meet the additional cost of construction of said building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, there is no information contained in the report in this case.

Mr. KEATING. The situation is a very simple one. The last Congress appropriated \$75,000 to construct a building at La Junta, Colo. The people of the city of La Junta donated a tract of land, valued at \$20,000, as a site for this building. The Supervising Architect had plans prepared and bids called for. The lowest bid was \$84,300, or \$9,300 above the limit of cost. That would necessitate a recasting of the plans. The plans as made were very satisfactory to the Supervising Architect and to the people of this town; and, in view of the fact that the public-spirited citizens of La Junta had donated this tract of land, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury recommended an increase of \$10,000 in the limit of cost.

Mr. MANN. Was this bill drawn in the Treasury Department?

Mr. KEATING. No, sir; I introduced the bill and took it to the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN. Then I will call the attention of the gentleman to the form of his bill, which I think ought to be changed.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very glad to accept such suggestions as the gentleman may offer. I am not an expert bill drafter.

Mr. MANN. It is not uncommon in making an appropriation to appropriate "\$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary," although that is not good form. But this is not an appropriation. The gentleman has used words which increase the limit of cost "\$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary." What the gentleman wants to do is to increase the limit of cost \$10,000, and have that settled. So all after the words "ten thousand dollars" ought to be stricken out.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman do me the favor to offer an amendment which will accomplish that result? I will deem it a favor if he will do so.

Mr. MANN. All right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. KEATING. I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the bill by striking out all after the figures "\$10,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out all after the words "ten thousand dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KEATING, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

BRIDGES, WISCONSIN AND MINNESOTA.

The next two bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent were the bills (H. R. 17762) to amend an act approved February 20, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the Interstate Trans-

fer Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota," and (H. R. 15727) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the next two bills on the calendar, H. R. 17762 and H. R. 15727, be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that these two bills be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? There was no objection.

POST-OFFICE SITE IN GASTONIA, N. C.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17764) to provide for sale of portion of post-office site in Gastonia, N. C.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell at public or private sale the following piece or parcel of land lying and being in the city of Gastonia, N. C., recently acquired by the Government of the United States for a public building, and more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of the site and running south 40 minutes east 58 feet to an iron pipe marking a corner of the site; thence west 6 degrees 33 minutes south 35 feet to an iron pipe; thence north no degrees 25 minutes west about 58 feet to the northern boundary of the site; thence east 6 degrees north about 35 feet to the place of beginning. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to execute a quitclaim deed to the highest bidder for the foregoing piece of land, which shall transfer title from the United States to such purchaser.

Sec. 2. That the proceeds arising from the sale of the property described be covered into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "public," strike out the words "or private," and, in the same line, after the word "sale," insert the words "for a consideration not less than \$2,500."

Page 2, line 7, strike out the words "highest bidder for" and insert the words "purchaser of."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to know why the Government wants to sell this property?

Mr. WEBB. The Government has no use for it.

Mr. MADDEN. Why did the Government purchase it?

Mr. WEBB. It was a part of a tract of land which belonged to a railroad, and the provisions of the transfer provided that if it ever ceased to be used for railroad property it should revert to the heirs of a man by the name of Davis. The whole site cost \$14,500, which the people of Gastonia and I thought was high. Here is a little neck of land, 55 by 35 feet, that has been lying there for five years unused and can not be used by the Government, and, as you see by a letter from the Treasury Department, is not needed.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this property go back to the original owner?

Mr. WEBB. No; it has been condemned, and if we sell it the proceeds go into the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. What proportional part of the total area is to be sold?

Mr. WEBB. Very small; about one-seventh or one-eighth.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from North Carolina will yield, I will show my colleague a plat of the land.

Mr. WEBB. It is a little shoulder running out in the rear, not needed by the Government, and I as a public-spirited Representative think it ought to be sold. There is an upset price in the bill and the money will be turned into the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. Does anybody want to buy it?

Mr. WEBB. I do not know of but one person who has inquired about it. He is a barber, and I do not know whether he can pay the \$2,500 or not.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose if he gets it he will get it by a close shave. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLARK of Florida). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WEBB, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DONATING IRON FENCE TO DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15575) donating the old iron fence around Vance Park, Charlotte, N. C., to the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Chapter, to be placed around Craighead Cemetery, near Sugar Creek Church, in Mecklenburg County.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the old iron fence around Vance Park, in the city of Charlotte, N. C., now being removed in the construction of a United States post-office and courthouse building, is hereby donated to the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Charlotte, N. C., for the purpose of being placed around the historic Revolutionary Craighead Cemetery, near Sugar Creek Church, in Mecklenburg County.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIS. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if the bill has the unqualified approval of the Treasury Department?

Mr. WEBB. I think I can answer the gentleman's question in the affirmative, as he will see by looking at a letter printed in the report from Secretary McAdoo.

Mr. WILLIS. That is exactly what I have been looking at, and I invite the attention of the gentleman to the letter. It says in the letter from the Treasury Department, at the top of page 2 in the report:

Attention is invited to the fact that the contract for the construction of the proposed extension to the present post-office and courthouse building has not yet been awarded, and work on the same has therefore not been started.

It says in the bill, "now being removed in the construction of the United States post-office and courthouse building."

It appears that the contract has not yet been let as stated in the bill. The bill and the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury are not in harmony.

Mr. WEBB. I can say that the post-office building is now in existence there on the site on which the new building will be erected, and also the assay office, about which the gentleman has heard something during his service here, are on the same lot; that an appropriation has been made for remodeling the assay office, and this iron fence is around the assay-office lot, and not around the post-office building. A large portion of the fence has already been removed in order to make improvements on the assay office, which will house post-office officials while the new building is being constructed.

Mr. WILLIS. But the improvement on the building has not yet been started.

Mr. WEBB. Not on the post-office building.

Mr. WILLIS. It says that the contract has not yet been awarded. But this is the more important matter, concerning which I wish to inquire: Is there anything in the bill guaranteeing the Government against any expense?

Mr. WEBB. There is nothing in the bill that imposes any expense on the Government.

Mr. WILLIS. I call attention to the recommendation of the Treasury Department in the last paragraph of the letter:

The department will interpose no objection to the legislation proposed by this bill, provided all repairs incident to the removal of the fence be made, and the grounds left in good condition, and that this work be done without expense to the Government.

The Secretary says that this removal should be made without any expense whatever to the Government.

That is not provided for in the bill, and consequently it does not meet with the recommendation of the Secretary.

Mr. WEBB. The committee considered that point, and they were of the opinion that the bill does not authorize any expense on the part of the Government, and therefore nobody would be allowed to incur any expense on the part of the Government. A portion of the fence has already been removed, and is going to rust and decay. There is nothing to do but to haul it out in the country and set it up around the Craighill Cemetery.

Mr. WILLIS. I am in hearty sympathy with the patriotic purpose of the bill, and I have no objection to taking the fence away if there will be no expense incurred on the part of the Government. The ground will not be left in good condition, and that expense will fall on the Government.

Mr. WEBB. I can assure the gentleman that unless the patriotic women who ask for the fence—the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence Chapter—are willing to incur the expense it will not be taken away at Government expense.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman object to an amendment providing that the work shall be done without expense to the Government? If such an amendment would be acceptable, I should withdraw all objection to the bill as I think its object is patriotic and proper.

Mr. WEBB. No; that was suggested in the committee, but it was not thought necessary.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for an amendment?

Mr. WEBB. Yes.

Mr. MANN. An amendment providing that without expense to the United States the ground shall be left in good condition upon the removal of the fence, including any proper and incidental repairs?

Mr. WEBB. I have no objection, because that is exactly what the Daughters of the American Revolution propose to do.

Mr. WILLIS. In view of the gentleman's statement, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"Provided, That without expense to the United States the ground shall be left in good condition upon the removal of the fence, including any proper and incidental repairs."

Mr. WEBB. I want to say to my friend from Illinois that the Government will have to remove the fence in order to build the building.

Mr. MANN. That would not impose any additional expense on the Government.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WEBB, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CRATER BATTLE FIELD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13923) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to designate, define, and survey the battle field of the Crater at Petersburg, Va., and to collect certain data concerning the same, and make report thereupon.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to appoint a commission consisting of three Army officers, or as many thereof as may be necessary, to survey, ascertain, and define the battle field near Petersburg, Va., known as the Crater farm, where the memorable engagement between the Federal and Confederate Armies occurred on July 30, 1864.

Sec. 2. That the said commission shall report upon the advisability and feasibility of the acquirement by the United States Government of the land on which this battle was fought, consisting of about 100 acres, for the purpose of preserving the same as a memorial of the war, a suitable site for the erection of monuments, and as a professional study for the military student; and in this connection said commission is authorized to ascertain and report what would be the probable cost of acquiring this property and the preservation of it as aforesaid.

Sec. 3. That to enable the Secretary of War to carry out the purposes of this act and to defray any expenses incurred by the commission in the performance of the duties hereby directed the sum of \$1,000, or such portion thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the authority of the Secretary of War.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to inquire into and report to Congress upon the advisability and practicability of purchasing the land near Petersburg, Va., containing 100 acres, more or less, known as the Crater farm, and preserving the same as a suitable memorial of the Civil War, a site for the erection of monuments, a professional study for the military student, and other public uses."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to inquire into and make report upon the advisability and practicability of purchasing the Crater farm, near Petersburg, Va."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Watson] that he will have to give very good reasons for asking us to pass by unanimous consent any proposition designed to purchase a battle field. We have had so many of these matters up since I have been in the House that I do not know where we will stop when we begin to consider them favorably. I tried for a long time myself to get the Congress to buy Appomattox field, but nay, nay; and I guess those who objected to it were right.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] that the motive underlying this proposition comes from the frequently expressed desires of the sol-

diers of the late Federal armies who were associated with this locality during the last year of the war. Many of the Grand Army of the Republic camps in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts have passed resolutions asking that steps be taken to secure this property, so that they may erect thereupon suitable monuments, and for other purposes, to commemorate their services at that period of the war. The land especially in contemplation embraces about 90 acres. It happens to be in the possession of the same family who owned it 50 years ago. The family contemplates a removal, and thus the property for the first time is available for purchase. These gentlemen from the North, who have already erected a considerable number of monuments in that locality, have been put to the necessity of acquiring private property for that purpose. In some instances these monuments have been practically buried in the woods. It is considered by the people interested in the proposition—and they are chiefly soldiers of the late Federal and Confederate Armies—that a suitable memorial site whereupon their monuments could be erected would be a most desirable acquisition.

I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if a proposition of this character has ever before been presented to Congress so entirely free of selfish and commercial aims, and resting as this one does altogether upon grounds of sentiment and public utility. This farm lies perhaps one-half mile from the corporate limits of the city of Petersburg. I have every reason to suppose that it can be acquired for a reasonable price, and when I say a reasonable price, I do not mean a price that would sound large even to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it would be within historical limits to say that, perhaps, this spot which it is sought to have the Government acquire is associated in the personal recollection of more soldiers of both sides in the late Civil War than any other spot on the Continent of America. I think it would be fair to say that in the neighborhood of 300,000 soldiers had direct personal association with this particular locality during the last year of the war. The Crater happens to have been the site of a very unique and spectacular engagement which occurred during the war, in many respects the most unique of the entire struggle. I do not believe that a single spot on the American Continent is personally remembered by so many soldiers as the battle field of the Crater. These are, of course, only sentimental considerations. The bill does not require that the Government acquire anything. It does not carry the appropriation of a cent of public money.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the gentleman's estimate of the cost, should we desire to acquire this, for the purposes mentioned, which I think are very praiseworthy.

Mr. WATSON. My information is that the whole property, which would include the battle field of over 90 acres and an adjoining 10 acres containing interesting breastworks of the contending armies, could be acquired inside of \$30,000, the whole within a mile of the corporate limits of Petersburg. The bill does not propose to pay anybody anything or appropriate a dollar of public money at this time. It simply provides that the Secretary of War shall investigate and report to Congress the exact data and information which the gentleman from New York asks for. I can not see that any harm could come from the passage of the bill, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman will allow it to pass without objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many of these propositions all of the time. The Government is engaged in giving away property which it owns, and gentlemen are always seeking to have it buy property which somebody else owns, and they usually make out a possible case, and perhaps often it ought to be done. But it is impossible for the Government to own all of the battle fields, improve them, and take care of them, and in recent years the Congress has not done so. Perhaps we have been too careful about it, but we own a number of very handsome and very creditable battle fields. We would not want to own simply 90 acres. Ninety acres would be just the beginning. If we owned a hundred acres there, we would soon own 1,000 acres and more, and we would need to do that.

Mr. WATSON. I will state to the gentleman that it would be impossible for him to get a thousand acres at this particular site, as these hundred acres embrace all the available and suitable area for the purpose named in the bill in that particular locality.

Mr. MANN. In any other direction but one—it is not important; it does not make any difference. At Gettysburg we take in the town of Gettysburg and everything around it.

Mr. WATSON. I will say that there is nothing which requires the Government to buy 90 acres or 10 acres or any

number of acres. This bill simply directs an investigation and report.

Mr. MANN. I understand there is nothing to require the Government to buy it as yet, but it is much easier to stop these things at the beginning than it is to wait until they become of great force. Of course I have great respect for the Confederate camps and the Grand Army of the Republic camps, but one man can start the ball rolling and get resolutions passed by 100 or 50 of them without wasting anything more than that many 2-cent postage stamps.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. Although probably they look at it from that point of view. I have no criticism of them for it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to tell him—

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. That this proposition may be said to have originated among ex-Union soldiers in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. It did not originate at Petersburg, although it has the cordial support of all its people.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the beginning of nearly every proposition of this kind is that some one person fairly well informed, half asleep on Sunday morning in church, not listening to the sermon, happens to think it is a brilliant idea and starts it in action and it just rolls along. Nobody else gives it much consideration. They just adopt it because that is the easiest way to do; but when people offer to pay money themselves for something, they think about it. It does not take a very generous man anywhere in the world to ask his neighbor to treat his neighbor's children well and give them a good education, fine clothes, and everything else of the sort. Generosity comes when you offer to do it yourself, and everywhere people are quite willing to have any expense borne by the National Treasury because they delude themselves with the notion that we make money by printing it, and it does not cost anybody anything.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield for one question? I desire to ask the gentleman from Virginia if he knows how many States have erected monuments in this vicinity or are proposing so to do? How many have already erected monuments?

Mr. WATSON. One State has erected a monument there upon this property by the owner's consent.

Mr. WILLIS. What State?

Mr. WATSON. It is the State of Massachusetts, I think. The State of Pennsylvania has erected a monument there close by, but not upon the property. In all I think there are three monuments to ex-Union soldiers in close proximity to the tract of land in question.

Mr. WILLIS. How large an area is covered by this famous crater? I never had an opportunity of visiting this historic battle field.

Mr. WATSON. The farm which embraces the breastworks which were involved in this particular engagement and the mine which was sunk comprises about 90 acres of land. The whole tract has been preserved intact and is now occupied by the same family who owned it 50 years ago.

Mr. WILLIS. Personally I am in favor of this bill. Because of the unique features connected with this battle ground, does the gentleman think it likely that there will be requests for purchase at other places in this vicinity than at this particular point? If this is to be the only site to be purchased in all this great historic battle field, it seems to me that fact is an argument in favor of this bill.

Mr. WATSON. I can say to the gentleman that the territory embraced within this area comprises everything within the present contemplation of those interested in this project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman know whether any of this Crater farm has been purchased by any State or by any organization for the purpose of using it as a cemetery or a place for erecting monuments?

Mr. WATSON. The monument which is already located on the land was located by the consent of the owner. There was no purchase price paid. On the contiguous plantation, where two other monuments have been erected, I think by Pennsylvania organizations, the site, I think, was purchased in one case and donated in the other.

Mr. NORTON. Has the city of Petersburg or the State of Virginia been interested sufficiently in this Crater farm at any time to purchase any part of it?

Mr. WATSON. What does the gentleman mean by acquiring title to any part? I do not think a foot of it has been owned

by anyone except the original owners, who have held it since the war.

Mr. NORTON. There has been no movement in Virginia by its citizens to purchase the Crater farm?

Mr. WATSON. It has not been offered for sale until within the last six months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17825) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near St. Francis, Ark.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Clay, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Arkansas, and the county of Dunklin, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Missouri, their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Francis River, at or near St. Francis, Ark., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

STEADYING THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 311.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) instructing American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture to present to the permanent committee for action at the general assembly in 1915 certain resolutions.

Resolved, etc., That in accordance with the authority of letter (f) of article 9 of the treaty establishing the institute, which provides that it shall "submit to the approval of the Governments, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers," the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture is hereby instructed to present (during the 1914 fall sessions) to the permanent committee the following resolutions, to the end that they may be submitted for action at the general assembly in 1915, so as to permit the proposed conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917:

"RESOLUTIONS.

"The general assembly instructs the International Institute of Agriculture to invite the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of steadying the world's price of the staples.

"This conference shall consist of members appointed by each of the Governments adhering to the institute, and is to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and on ocean freight rates with consultative, deliberative, and advisory powers.

"Said conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. I demand a second.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] as tellers.

The House divided.

The SPEAKER. The tellers report that on this vote the ayes are 73 and noes none. So a second is ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think there ought to be more than 73 Members in the House. I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Is there any question before the House?

The SPEAKER. A motion to suspend the rules is before the House.

Mr. GARNER. Was the House dividing on the question, so that there is no necessity for a call of the House? It seems to me it is an automatic call.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Speaker had not announced the result.

The SPEAKER. It does not make any difference about the result.

Mr. MANN. I did not make the point of no quorum in objecting to the second at all.

The SPEAKER. Did not the gentleman make the point of no quorum?

Mr. MANN. I made a point of no quorum, but I had no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Elder	Kiess, Pa.	Post
Aiken	Esch	Kindel	Powers
Ainey	Estopinal	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Prouty
Ansberry	Fairchild	Knowland, J. R.	Ragsdale
Anthony	Faison	Korby	Rainey
Aswell	Farr	Kreider	Reilly, Conn.
Austin	Fess	Lee, Ga.	Riordan
Bartholdt	Fitzgerald	L'Engle	Roberts, Mass.
Bartlett	Fowler	Lenroot	Rothermel
Bathrick	Frear	Lever	Sabath
Bell, Ga.	Gardner	Levy	Scully
Broussard	Garrett, Tex.	Lewis, Pa.	Sells
Brown, N. Y.	George	Lindquist	Shackleford
Brown, W. Va.	Gillett	Lobeck	Sherley
Browne, Wis.	Gittins	Loft	Smith, Md.
Browning	Godwin, N. C.	McGillicuddy	Smith, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Goeke	Mahan	Steenerson
Byrnes, S. C.	Goldfogle	Maher	Stevens, N. H.
Calder	Gordon	Martin	Stringer
Candler, Miss.	Gorman	Merritt	Switzer
Cantor	Graham, Ill.	Metz	Talbott, Md.
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	Montague	Taylor, Ala.
Carew	Griest	Morin	Townsend
Carr	Guernsey	Moss, W. Va.	Treadway
Carter	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Tuttle
Cary	Hardwick	Mulkey	Underhill
Chandler, N. Y.	Hart	Murdock	Vare
Church	Hay	Neely, W. Va.	Vollmer
Claypool	Hensley	Nelson	Walker
Coady	Hill	Oglesby	Wallin
Copley	Hinds	O'Hair	Watkins
Covington	Hoxworth	O'Shaunessy	Whitacre
Crisp	Hughes, W. Va.	Palmer	Wilson, Fla.
Danforth	Humphreys, Miss.	Parker	Wilson, N. Y.
Dixon	Jones	Patton, Pa.	Winslow
Doelling	Keister	Payne	Woodruff
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Woods
Eagle	Kent	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. On this vote 280 Members have responded—a quorum.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. A quorum is present, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] for 20 minutes.

[Mr. FLOOD of Virginia addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Goodwin].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Goodwin] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the International Institute of Agriculture is a Government institution, having its seat permanently at Rome, Italy. It is supported by a treaty between 54 adhering Governments, including the United States.

The purpose of this resolution is to instruct the American delegate to that institute, Mr. David Lubin, to invite a conference of the adhering Governments to consider the question of creating finally an international commerce commission for the control of freight rates on the high seas. Hearings were had last year by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Alexander] is chairman, and those hearings consist of four volumes, covering a voluminous report, showing that there is a great shipping trust in control of ocean freight rates. A similar report was made by the Royal Commission of England, consisting of two large volumes. Another report was made by the Canadian commission, consisting, I believe, of three volumes. All those reports show indubitably that there exists throughout the world a great shipping trust controlling ocean freight

rates, and that these rates have increased from 100 to 200 per cent within the past two years.

It was shown in the hearings had before the Committee on Foreign Affairs that of the total freight carried overseas, excluding mail and passenger traffic, only two-ninths consist of package freight or articles of manufacture; that the other seven-ninths consist largely of agricultural products. The testimony adduced by these commissions, as well as by other investigators, reflects the further fact that upon all package traffic in manufactured articles the ship carrier is required to give from 30 to 60 days' notice of any change of freight for the purpose of making stable the freight rate. The evidence further shows that upon agricultural or staple products no notice at all is required, but that the carrier—the shipowner—arbitrarily changes his rates not only from day to day, but from hour to hour, thus making unstable all freight traffic upon the staples or agricultural products.

The grower of agricultural products receives so much for his products, less the cost of transportation.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I have only a few minutes, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I understand that there is a bill coming in here appropriating \$25,000,000 to enable the Government to buy ships and go into the shipping business itself. It will steady the freight rates when it does that, will it not?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Oh, the Government of the United States might spend \$100,000,000, Mr. Speaker, in the purchase of ships, and then "Uncle Sam" would not control the shipping interests of the world. The ships that may be bought for this \$25,000,000 would be but a small segment in the great circle of the world's commerce.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The gentleman will understand, whatever the rate is, that it will tend to steady the other rates and bring all to a level that we set with our \$25,000,000 worth of ships?

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. That \$25,000,000 worth of ships bought by this Government would not steady rates, nor do I understand it would pretend to steady rates. I do not know whether the gentleman is opposed to this resolution or not.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I was asking a question. I am not indicating my position on the bill.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my time is quite limited, with due deference to my friend from Texas, I do not care to be further interrupted.

The world's price of the staples of agriculture is controlled at the point of export. This year's American crop of wheat will exceed possibly 900,000,000 bushels. It has been shown that if the cost of the transportation of wheat across the seas is but 1 cent per bushel, at that rate it would be \$9,000,000. If it were 25 cents a bushel it would be \$225,000,000. The evidence taken by the commissions, as well as by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as testified to by Mr. Lubin, the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture, shows that from time to time bulk traffic, such as wheat and cotton, may be carried gratis for the reason that when a ship is under orders to sail, the ship must sail upon a certain day and upon a certain hour.

If that ship be lacking in ballast she must have ballast or else she will turn turtle. Therefore, a ship to-day may carry a cargo of wheat or of cotton without any charge whatever. As to cotton, it happens very infrequently, as compared to the number of cargoes of wheat that are carried gratis. Not that the shipowners are philanthropists or accustomed to giving alms to the shipper, but for the purpose of running out of business the independent steamers and ships that are not owned by the Shipping Trust.

If wheat is \$1 per bushel in Liverpool, the quotation is made to all markets of the world that wheat is \$1. If the price of carrying that wheat across the sea is 25 cents per bushel, the producer of that wheat receives not \$1 for his wheat in New York or in Chicago or any other export point, but \$1 less 25 cents. If the price of cotton, for instance, in Liverpool be 15 cents a pound, the producer of cotton will not receive 15 cents a pound for his cotton exported from New York, New Orleans, or Galveston, but he will receive so much less the cost of transportation, because the quotation mark means the price at the place of delivery, in Liverpool or in London. The great agricultural products of the world are not sold like package traffic, are not sold like boots and shoes, and typewriters, and other manufactured products. The great agricultural products of the world are sold upon the exchanges. They are sold in the pit,

they are sold upon the bourse; and these prices are telegraphed, are megaphoned, so to speak, throughout all corners of the earth. They change from day to day, whereas the products of manufacture, not bulk traffic, but package traffic, are not thus sold. They are bartered and sold in private. The manufacturer sells to the jobber, and the jobber sells to the retail merchant.

The retail merchant sells to his customer, and the carriage price of shoes may change across the high seas, but if so, notice of from 30 to 60 days must be given whether the price is to be raised or lowered, for the reason that the manufacturer can not figure the cost of his goods with pencil and paper unless he knows the exact cost of transportation. But the producer of agricultural products has no knowledge to-day what the price of the carriage of his wheat, his corn, or his cotton may be to-morrow. Therefore he may say that whereas wheat is worth \$1 to-day in Liverpool, and the cost of carriage to-day across the seas be 1 cent a bushel, to-morrow it may be also \$1 per bushel in Liverpool, but the carriage across seas to-morrow may be 25 cents per bushel. So he is at last and finally at the mercy and subject to the whim and caprice and arbitrary will of the carrier—the shipowner. [Applause.]

Manufactured goods or package traffic and agricultural products or staples, as they are called, are never placed upon the same footing as regards the prices that the producer may finally receive, for the reason, as stated a moment ago, that whereas manufactured goods are sold in private by dealing with the individual, and the price does not necessarily become established, but may change with the next order or sale. But with agricultural products the rule is different. These products being sold upon the exchange, in the pit, or on the bourse, the prices quoted are made throughout the world, and every bushel of wheat and of corn and every bale of cotton is controlled by the quotation. Prices on manufactured goods, as well as freight traffic on same, are fairly stable and change but little from week to week or month to month, as one transaction does not necessarily affect hundreds of thousands of other transactions made at the same moment in all parts of the world, whereas quotations on agricultural products, changing from day to day or from hour to hour, are not only affected in all parts of the world alike, but are doubly affected by the instability and uncertainty of freight rates on same, which the evidence shows vary not only from day to day but from hour to hour.

The home market on agricultural products is affected not merely by the market quotation but by the transportation charge as well. So it happens that the merchant, the wholesaler, the manufacturer may figure with pencil and paper to a nicety, to a certainty the cost of his goods laid down, but the grower of agricultural products, not having a fixed charge, not knowing the value of his products from day to day or the cost of carriage on same, is unable to even approximate with pencil and paper the price he is to receive for the output of his toil. The broker or commission merchant who may handle the staples of agriculture, likewise uncertain as to the cost or carriage, discounts the price at the maximum charge in order to come out safe and whole, while the cost upon some of his transactions may be the minimum and not the maximum; so the grower of agricultural products is caught by the broker or the commission man when this happens to be the case. And when, perchance, the ship carrier transports a cargo of wheat, cotton, or corn without charge for transportation the man who grows these products is not benefited by this free transportation, and the world may be challenged to show that he is benefited thereby, for the reason that agricultural products being sold upon the exchange are bought by the foreign purchaser not from the man who grows the cotton or the corn, for he sells not direct to the foreign purchaser, but in the meantime these articles from the farm have changed hands once or twice and are bought from the elevator man, who may have millions of bushels of wheat stored away, or from the cotton factors or commission merchants, who may have many thousands of bales of cotton bought or become agents for cotton grown by the farmers, and if a cargo of cotton or wheat is occasionally carried across the seas without charge the buyer abroad in London, Liverpool, Berlin, or Paris does not deal directly with the producer of these products but with the man at the point of export—Galveston, New Orleans, New York. So, after all, I repeat, if occasionally a cargo of agricultural products be carried free of charge the producer of these products, the man whose labor and investments have been expended to bring them into the world, does not become the beneficiary of this occasional free transportation for the additional reason that the merchant or cotton factor or elevator man deducts from the farmer when the purchase is made, not the minimum, but the maximum charge for transportation. There-

fore the growers of agricultural products should be placed and desire to be placed in the same condition as his neighbor, the manufacturer, the wholesaler, the commission man, or the merchant, as regards stability of transportation over the seas.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the object of this resolution, which I have the honor to report favorably from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has for its ultimate aim, through certain channels, the processes to be initiated by the International Institute of Agriculture, the creation finally of an international commerce commission for the stabilizing of ocean freight, as set forth in resolution No. 311.

It is strange, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the great agricultural interests of the country have not been aroused to the importance of this question and the seeming lack of knowledge of the discrimination and injustice dealt to them in the way of ocean freight rates, but they are just now becoming aware of the importance of this question, and if the agricultural people in the great countries of the world demand, as they should, their rights to see that they are placed upon the same footing as the manufacturers and those who deal in package traffic, the consummation of this idea, which is the dream of Mr. Lubin, the father of the International Institute of Agriculture, will be realized.

How, it may be asked, has this discrimination between the manufacturer on the one hand and the agricultural producer on the other been brought about? Why, sir, does the ship carrier give from 30 to 60 days' notice of a change in freight rates to the manufacturer or importer of package traffic, thus stabilizing his freights, which are but two-ninths of the over-sea traffic, but arbitrarily, and without warning or notice, changes the ocean rates, not only daily, but hourly if necessary, on agricultural or staple products, which amount to seven-ninths of ocean traffic, excluding mail and passengers? I will tell you why. The manufacturers and importers are powerful men financially. They are well organized, are within easy touch and communication, reside in cities and other centers of population, their aggregate wealth and influence being beyond the realm of approximation, and if ocean freight rates were not stable on package traffic and if the carrier should change his freight rates arbitrarily on such traffic, as he does upon the staples of agriculture, a great howl would go up—yea, the tumult would be thunderous, and the ship carriers would be bombarded by this organized craft of business men until the ship carrier would be forced to meet their demands, the very order that obtains to-day, which brings stability in ocean freights on package traffic.

But the farmers are not thus organized. They have not the same means of business intercourse or intercommunication. Scattered here and there, unorganized, disorganized, they sell that which they produce not in concert but individually and at random. But they are waking up, as was evidenced by the appearance before our committee of Mr. William T. Creasy, master of the Pennsylvania State Grange, and Mr. George P. Hampton, the representative in Washington of the State granges of eight of the large agricultural States. This proposition is also highly indorsed by Mr. H. S. Mobley, president of the Farmers' Union of Arkansas, who was in Washington for 10 days recently. This Government is confronted with many great problems—yea, too numerous to mention. Some of these may be shown by the demands and platforms of political conventions. I do not underrate the importance of many of these, but the supreme question of the hour—the vital question that goes to the heart and the home of every producer whose individual toil enters into the price of his output—is the justice, the equity of exchange, and none so much as the equity in the exchange of agricultural products.

Let us break the chains that manacle the arms and shackle the feet of those who feed and clothe the world.

I desire at this point, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the testimony of Mr. Lubin, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the following:

MR. LUBIN. Of course, if there is no truth in the statements set forth here—if there is no truth in the four volumes of the report gotten up by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries—if there is no truth in the statements gotten up by the British Board, by the royal commission, then of course there is nothing before this committee, and we ought to adjourn. We would then be wasting time. But if there is truth in the statements set forth, then there can be no objection to a deliberative, consultative, and advisory body. And it should be a permanent organization, of course. Otherwise a mere conference would do no more good than the conference held here if it adjourned to-morrow and did nothing. But a permanent body framed like that of the International Institute of Agriculture, with delegates who would have special knowledge of the subject, delegates consisting of members of the different countries of the world together with the representatives of the shipowners, by holding public hearings, would reach the people everywhere, and we would soon know the equities in the case, and what ought to be done, and so forth.

The question before us is not unimportant. I doubt whether the war that is being carried on to-day by all the great European powers is of any more importance than the question before us. But it is an obscure one. If it had not been so obscure it would have been put before the people long ago. Civilization is not asleep—that which goes to make civilization. We have evidence of that in this watch [showing watch]. Some of the best minds of the world have been at work and have made us the watch. It was not long ago that the King of England had a candle with stripes around it, red, brown, blue, etc., and when it burned down to such a mark it was such o'clock. That was the clock, and we have worked from the painted candle up to the watch. And from the remarkable blank of the Indian we have come to the Jacquard loom. These things, of course, we need not talk of here. We know of the wonders, the Godlike wonders, in the power of development of man.

But when we come to the chief of all things, the primary things, the first things, the domain of exchange between man and man, the alpha of human ken seems to be awfully clumsy, not much nearer to the true line than the clumsy Indian. It is strange, but it is a fact.

We find in the domain of exchange—and, by the way, if the Bible teaches anything it teaches equity in exchange. It does not teach, as some would have it, that religion means a little lady or gentleman floating around in the sky with mosquito-bar clothes on. The old prophets never spoke of any such thing as that; Jesus never spoke of any such thing as that. That is idolatry. What they spoke about was equity here in exchange, that is all. And we have missed that and have gone off to idolatry and we haven't got equity in exchange at all. How curious it is that members of our chambers of commerce will work tooth and nail with all their power in the interest of trade on the importation and exportation of neckties and boot blacking and clothing and skirts and typewriters. But where are their efforts of equity in exchange, so far as the food products of the people are concerned, the food that must go to feed this Nation, and more yet, the great family of 1,800,000,000 people—the men, women, and children of the world? The equities in the exchange of these products are in such primitive shape that we could not excuse ourselves if an intelligent man from Mars came down here to-day and said, "Gentlemen, show me an example of your civilization." And the very first thing he would touch upon would be the equities in the exchange of the staples—the food products of the people and the raw material for their clothes. The very first thing he would touch upon would be the exchange of these things, and he would find it crude, clumsy, wasteful, and unjust. Our Jacquard looms, our electric lights, our science, our philosophy, and our religion would be waived aside for the moment, and he would consider the weightier questions—the equities in the exchange of the food products. This would be the scale that he would weigh us in, and in this scale would we not be found wanting?

Bring before your committee the presidents of the chambers of commerce and of your boards of trade, and the masters of economics, and ask them to defend the present system in the exchange of the staples—the food products of the people of the world and the raw material for their clothes. Ask them whether there is equity in this exchange. And what will be their answer? They could not say yes, unless they lied. And yet what are the chambers of commerce for? How have they spoken in the four volumes published here by your committee? They have not touched upon the equities of this question at all that I can see. And are they not censurable for this neglect of what is clearly the duty of a chamber of commerce and of an economist?

Now, let us get to the whole proposition, because we have not time for an extended speech.

With the power of mind and judgment and skill as shown in these four volumes of your committee, the work of the chambers of commerce, the work of our economists, we should know the laws governing the equities in exchange. And in what direction do they lead us? This, that the fellow that exports neckties and typewriters and shoe blacking, to him is given their whole power and energy, whatever power they possess. This goes into giving these people the equity. What about the equities in exchange of the staples of agriculture? We see that shoe blacking and typewriters, shirts and hats, have fixed rates for ocean carriage, with 30 or 60 days' notice of change from their fixed rates. But the staples of agriculture have no fixed rates whatever. Their rates are fixed from "day to day or hour to hour."

I desire to quote further from Mr. Lubin, whose great mind conceived not only the importance of establishing an international institute of agriculture but for the final deliverance from bondage of the great masses of the people who by their toil feed and clothe the world. When the names of many men now in public life shall have been forgotten, that of Mr. David Lubin will be remembered in the hearts of men of all time for his unselfish and altruistic work in behalf of that class of people who have not been in the minds of most men who legislate in the parliaments of earth. Speaking of the discrimination between those who toil and are not remembered and those who speculate upon the labors of their fellows who toil, Mr. Lubin has this to say:

From the facts elicited at these inquiries it would seem as though there are "godfathers," so to speak, on the lookout for all the interests involved, excepting for those of the staples. There is a godfather for iron, the Steel Trust; a godfather for agricultural implements, the Harvester Trust; a godfather for oils, the Standard Oil Trust; there is a godfather for the carriers, the shipping rings; a godfather for the commission men and the dealers handling the "package traffic," the chamber of commerce and the board of trade; but there is no godfather for the staples of agriculture, no godfather to represent the interests of the producer and of the consumer.

But the question arises: Would it have made any practical difference to the outcome if the interests of the producer and of the consumer had been represented at these inquiries? Let us see.

It seems to me that no matter how competent the testimony offered by a body representing the farmers or the consumers, no matter how honest the committee before which such testimony would be given, no matter how able the proposals for legislation which that committee might draft, it would all be ineffective unless the evidence given indicated the international bearing of the subject and unless the findings deduced therefrom recommended action on international lines. So long as the findings would fail to recommend international action they

must necessarily fall short of applying adequate means to the ends in view. That this is worthy of serious consideration will be apparent from the following:

In the case of "package traffic" the terms and conditions of ocean carriage mainly concern the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer. In the case of "bulk traffic" the traffic in the staples of agriculture, the terms and conditions of ocean carriage, concern the economic welfare of the people everywhere.

To illustrate: Under "package traffic," whether the rate on shipments of shoes or cutlery, for instance, be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, affects the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer.

But with "bulk traffic" the case is different. In the carriage of the staples of agriculture, whether the rate be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, concerns not merely the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer, but it concerns the economic condition of the people everywhere, as will be shown further on.

At this time it would be well to bear in mind that while, on the one hand, "package traffic" comprises that class of merchandise which is bought and sold by private purchase and sale, by private contract, "bulk traffic," on the other hand, comprises, in the main, the staples of agriculture which are bought and sold in the world's bourses and exchanges at the world's price.

And what do we mean when we say the "world's price?"

We mean the price that is tendered and accepted in the world's bourses and exchanges, which we might call the world's auction rooms. And how is this price arrived at?

The first factor in arriving at the world's price is the prevailing opinion as to the state of the world's supply. If the supply be above the normal, the price is expected to fall below the normal; if the supply be below the normal, the price is expected to rise above the normal.

By "supply" we do not mean the quantity produced or available in any one locality, in any one country; we mean the total world's supply. The supply in any given State may be above the normal, and yet if, at the same time, it be below the normal for the world, the price in that State should, nevertheless, be high. Or, vice versa, the supply in a given State may be below the normal, yet if the world's supply be above the normal the price in that State should be low.

But the supply is by no means the only factor in the formation of the world's price. There is another factor, and an important one, the cost of ocean carriage. If the average cost of ocean carriage be above the normal, it should correspondingly reduce the price paid to the producer below the normal. And, on the contrary, if the average cost of ocean carriage be below the normal it should correspondingly raise the price paid to the producer above the normal.

Therefore, calculations on rational lines for arriving at a knowledge of what the world's price ought to be should, first of all, take into consideration the status of the world's supply, and, secondly, the status of the cost of ocean carriage.

If there were fixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples, the Liverpool buyer would be able to make offers for given quantities of wheat, for instance, on a basis of rational calculations. But let us take the case as it stands at present. A shipper at Buenos Aires receives an order for wheat to be delivered in Liverpool at the ruling world's price, at, say, \$1 a bushel; how much should he pay for that wheat at Buenos Aires? If the cost of delivery is, say, 10 cents a bushel, the world's price should then be 90 cents a bushel in Buenos Aires. If the cost of delivery is 30 cents, the world's price in Buenos Aires should then be 70 cents. But if he is to ship the wheat in 30 or 60 days' time, how is the shipper to tell what the cost of carriage will then be? As the rates for the ocean carriage of the staples are not fixed, how is he to know? He does not know.

As we have seen, the Chamber of Commerce of New York states that wheat is carried at one time free of charge as ballast and at another time at a charge of 10d. and 12d. per bushel; and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce writes that "rates fluctuate from day to day, and a rate reported to-day might be twice as high or half as low to-morrow." Therefore, the shipper must guess, and so must everyone else guess, so long as rates are unfixed. If the shipper wins on the guess, what he wins comes directly out of the pocket of the producer; if he loses, he tries hard to recoup himself in his next deal, and also out of the producer's pocket.

But this is only the beginning of the mischief. The confusion arising out of the system of unfixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples and the consequent uncertainty in price determining lead to economic evils so far-reaching as to affect the people everywhere.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution. The International Institute of Agriculture has already accomplished a splendid purpose. Prior to the time it was organized it was practically impossible to get accurate crop reports of the world from authentic sources. Speculators who wanted to manipulate the markets of the world had agents in different agricultural countries, and these speculators could give out any reports they desired in order to show either an excess of production or a shortage of production of any or all of the great staples of agriculture. There were many people who looked upon the formation of the institute with more or less misgiving; but since it has been founded 54 nations of the world have subscribed to the protocol under which it was organized; and to-day each one of these countries sends official reports every month to Rome, where the headquarters of the institute are located. These reports in turn are sent to every country on earth, and, as a result, the producers and consumers throughout the world know to-day what the authentic crop reports of practically every civilized nation may be.

Now, the question of ocean carriage has much to do with fixing the price of many of these staples that the whole world

consumes. At the present time the ocean-carrying freight varies on the staples of agriculture practically from day to day. The manufactured commodities have steady and fixed rates; the various steamship companies have agreements under the terms of which they will not change these latter rates except upon 30 or 60 days' notice to each other. No such agreement holds with regard to corn or wool or cotton or the foodstuffs which the world requires. The consequence is that the producer of these commodities is constantly at the mercy of the ocean carriers so far as the price he gets for his commodity is concerned, because in most instances the price of his commodity is fixed, not in the United States but in some foreign country. And therefore the farmer's price in the United States is the foreign price less the cost of carriage to the foreign port where the world price is made.

It is proposed under the terms of this resolution to allow the American delegate to the International Institute to bring up the question of an international commerce commission before the nations that are subscribers to the institute. This international commerce commission will be organized for the purpose of investigating ocean-carrying freight with the view of regulating the ocean-carrying freight, just as was done in the investigation and regulation of interstate railroad rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission in this country.

When it was first proposed to create the Interstate Commerce Commission it was held by many well-meaning people that it was not a matter that the Government had a right to take up at all. Gradually the decisions of the commission convinced the people of the United States that a good work was being accomplished by that commission, and Congress from time to time has passed additional legislation conferring broader and more extensive power on the Interstate Commerce Commission. I dare say that throughout the country to-day there is a feeling that the formation of that commission was an excellent piece of legislative work. How far the foreign countries will go in taking up and considering this matter we can not say. This resolution, as I understand it, does no more than to authorize the American delegate to present the matter in 1915 informally, and then formal action will be taken by the institute in 1917. Personally I feel the passage of the resolution is a step in the right direction. I recognize the fact that the project may meet with some opposition from the great maritime nations. But I believe many of the abuses that now exist in the ocean-carrying business ought to be regulated. Conditions that allow some of the steamship companies to maintain so-called "fighting" ships, whose purpose is to destroy competition by cutting rates to so low a figure that the competing company is driven from the zone occupied by the company that maintains the "fighting" ships, are highly injurious to the world's shippers. They ought to be eradicated, and the international commerce commission would be an instrument by means of which such conditions could be prevented.

It seems to me that if the ocean carriers can fix a definite rate on "package freight," which is the designation applied to manufactured articles, there is no substantial reason why a fixed rate can not be made on "bulk freight," as the staples of agriculture are designated in the ocean-carrying business. It may be contended that wheat and other grains are sometimes carried as ballast without any charges whatever for the ocean carriage. But while that may be true on some occasions, the great bulk of grain shipments across the water have to pay ocean freight.

And this, it seems to me, is the more essential, the more necessary, because "bulk freight" constitutes seven-ninths of all the merchandise carried on the seas. In other words, the staples of agriculture constitute nearly 78 per cent of all the cargoes carried on the world's great ocean highways. It seems obvious that if fluctuation in the cost of carrying this great mass of agricultural products can be prevented or even controlled, there must be greater certainty and stability in the prices the farmers of the great producing nations will receive for their products. I say, therefore, we are justified in passing this resolution in order that our delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture may endeavor to enlist the interest of the peoples of the world in this great problem.

Reference has been made here to Mr. David Lubin, the United States delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture. I have known him well for many years. He is a citizen of the State of California, where he has resided almost continuously since his boyhood. All his life his ambition has been to serve his fellow men, unselfishly, disinterestedly, earnestly. When the present king of Italy adopted Mr. Lubin's plan for an international institute of agriculture our Government appointed him as its delegate, and he has occupied that

station since the institute was organized. He is an indefatigable worker—a man of tremendous energy and force. He is a student of the great problems that affect the welfare of the agriculturists the world over. He has given this subject of the ocean-carrying trade great thought and study. With the backing of his Government, as expressed in the pending resolution, I do not doubt but that he will be able to present the matter to the representatives of the world's maritime powers in a manner that will challenge their attention. If he can accomplish the object sought by the resolution, his countrymen, and especially the producers of farm products, will owe him an everlasting debt of gratitude.

ADJOURNMENT OVER MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday it adjourn to meet the following Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday next it adjourn to meet again on Tuesday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that there are pressing matters that ought to be finished this week. I do not know how long the Alaskan coal bill will take. The situation in Alaska is such that they can not mine the coal out there. With a country full of coal they have to ship it in from other countries. I think it is very important that the bill should get through this week.

On the other hand, next Monday is unanimous-consent day, and I think it is important for the personnel of the House that the day should not be dispensed with. But as far as Labor Day is concerned, I know that a number of gentlemen have made engagements for that day, and I have no disposition to interfere with it, and if it will be satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois, I would like to have him modify his request and ask that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, and that the business that will be in order on Monday shall be in order on Tuesday.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will accept that modification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois modifies his request and asks that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on the next Tuesday, and that on Tuesday the business that would be in order on Monday shall be in order on Tuesday. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to modify my request, and ask that when the House adjourn on Saturday it adjourn to meet on the following Tuesday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withdraw that request at the present time, for I can not agree to that now.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will say that, as the gentleman probably knows, there are quite a number of Members who have engagements on Monday. I have none myself, and I expect to remain in Washington, so that it makes no difference to me, but a number of Members have made previous engagements—made them before the recent resolution was adopted—to be in their districts on that day. The campaign is on, and I think the gentleman from Alabama ought not to object. Of course, if he does I will withdraw the request.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that there are some bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar that his own people are interested in; they have been to see me about them, and they are bills which ought to be passed. I will make another request for a different order. I am anxious not to interfere with gentlemen who have engagements next Monday. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, and that it shall be in order on Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal, to call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, and that on Tuesday the Calendar for Unanimous Consent shall be in order after the reading of the Journal. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand from the statement of the gentleman that he is desirous this week of finishing the Alaskan coal bill, and that he would have no objection if we can get that bill out of the way even to adjourning on Friday.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I will not say that. I will say to the gentleman candidly that I think the Clayton antitrust bill will go to conference probably between now and then; and if it does go to conference, I believe, if we clear up these emer-

gency measures, we can get through this session of Congress by the 1st of October, if not sooner. I think it is more important that we should use the time in getting through than in adjourning. There is an exception for Labor Day, because lots of gentlemen have made engagements for that day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Alabama seriously think that adjourning over Saturday or Monday will have anything to do with or any influence upon the determination as to final adjournment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It might to some extent; but there are important bills here that gentlemen want to get through with.

Mr. MANN. We have been in session continuously for a year and a half, nearly—I do not know how long; I have lost the count, so far as I am concerned—and certainly no one would have a right to complain if the House should take one day off. Those who stayed here will not complain, and those who have just come back ought not to complain.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is something in the gentleman's last remark, at any rate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if we get through with the Alaskan bill on Thursday and send the Clayton antitrust bill to conference on Friday, would not the gentleman be willing to adjourn over Saturday until the following Tuesday? There are a great many persons living near by—as far away even as Boston—who would like to take advantage of leaving here Friday afternoon and coming back here Tuesday, and if we can have some such assurance we would like to have it from the leader of the majority.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is possible and probable that the President may desire to deliver a message to the House before that time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that those who have stayed here regularly probably will not go away very far, and those who have now shown up for the first time in months ought to get acquainted with Washington before they go away again.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, and when Friday comes, if there is no pressing business, we can take up then the question of adjourning over Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on the following Tuesday and that on Tuesday the Calendar for Unanimous Consent shall be called immediately after the reading of the Journal? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STEADYING THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Virginia 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FALCONER].

[Mr. FALCONER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the subject of this resolution was called to my attention by Mr. David B. Lubin, who is the permanent delegate of the United States to the National Institute of Agriculture at Rome. He had read my report on steamship conferences and agreements in the domestic and foreign trade, and he was convinced that our Government would be impotent to enforce reasonable rates or stabilize rates on farm products in international trade in the absence of an international agreement, and that is true. In the bill which was drawn to carry out the recommendations of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House bill 17328, we have gone just as far as we may under the law to bring all the lines, domestic and foreign, under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and so far as those engaged in the coastwise trade are concerned, to regulate their rates; but many reasons will suggest themselves to gentlemen why it is wholly impracticable for this Government to regulate international freight rates. I have not the time to enumerate them, much less to discuss them in detail, nor is it necessary at this time. The investigations made by the committee showed that, so far as package freight is concerned, the conference lines have a uniform rate, which usually is not raised or lowered until after 60 days' notice. The shippers who appeared before the committee were all unanimous in the opinion that the stabilizing of rates was very important in the export trade, and that it was very desirable that they might know how to

make their contracts. They would then know one of the factors—and a very important one—in the price of the commodity they would sell for future delivery, namely, the freight rates to be charged on the commodity. Now, so far as grain is concerned, the testimony before the committee showed that the rate varies daily, if not hourly, often depending upon the demand upon the part of the great ocean liners for ballast. Under the agreement between the conference committee the quantity of grain that one of the ocean liners may carry is limited. Mr. Lubin contends, and with great force, that in order to steady the world's price of the staples it is necessary to stabilize the freight rates on the staples, and that this can not be done until the ocean freight rate on the commodity from the seaboard to the point of delivery in Europe or South America or elsewhere in our over-sea trade is known with reasonable certainty. In years past, as the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] has said, the operators on boards of trade and chambers of commerce influenced the price of wheat, cotton, and other staples from day to day by giving out information, more or less guesswork and in many instances manipulated, with reference to the condition of crops and the probable yield in the different countries of the world.

The international institute at Rome, in which Mr. Lubin has so ably represented this Government as permanent delegate, has undertaken to correct this evil. The Government reports, the official reports, the forecasts, are made from time to time by the Government agencies of the 54 signatory States to this institute, and are compiled and disseminated to the different countries, and that element of speculation has been largely eliminated. Having accomplished this task, Mr. Lubin is in favor of taking another step. He is an enthusiast, but not an idle dreamer. He is of the opinion that if the 54 nations parties to the international convention of 1905 creating the International Institute of Agriculture, and supporting the institute, can be brought to agree to the establishment of an international commerce commission, vested with power to stabilize the rates or regulate the rates on the staples of agriculture, another essential factor in steadying the world's price of the products of the farm will be fixed and another element of speculation eliminated. I fully realized when I introduced this resolution that we were undertaking a difficult task, but that is no reason why we should not make the effort. It can not be accomplished in any other way. It is an international problem, and can only be solved by international agreement. This resolution does no more than to authorize Mr. Lubin, in October, to propose to the permanent committee the resolution set out in this joint resolution, which is as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) instructing American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture to present to the permanent committee for action at the general assembly in 1915 certain resolutions.

Resolved, etc., That in accordance with the authority of letter (f) of article 9 of the treaty establishing the institute, which provides that it shall "submit to the approval of the Governments, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers," the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture is hereby instructed to present (during the 1914 fall sessions) to the permanent committee the following resolutions, to the end that they may be submitted for action at the general assembly in 1915, so as to permit the proposed conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917:

"RESOLUTIONS.

"The general assembly instructs the International Institute of Agriculture to invite the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of steadying the world's price of the staples.

"This conference shall consist of members appointed by each of the Governments adhering to the institute, and is to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and on ocean freight rates, with consultative, deliberative, and advisory powers.

"Said conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917."

If they regard it favorably they will present the resolution to the general assembly in 1915. If the general assembly agrees that it is a subject that will promote the interests of the farmers and they regard the time opportune, they will then take steps to call an international conference in 1917 to consider the question of organizing this international commerce commission, to be vested with the powers set out in the resolution. That is the whole question in a nutshell. We all agree that that is the only rational way to get at it. Whether it is possible to accomplish our purpose in that way or not, of course we do not know. That will depend upon the attitude of the nations controlling the larger part of the ocean-borne commerce of the world. I am quite sure it is worthy of the effort. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the following is the very able report Mr. Lubin has prepared to present to the permanent committee for consideration in connection with House joint resolution 311, if the latter becomes a law. I have not the time to read or comment on it in the brief time allotted to me:

STEADYING THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES—INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE REGULATION AND CONTROL OF OCEAN CARRIAGE BY MEANS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE COMMISSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF STEADYING THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES.

(By David Lubin, delegate of the United States International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy.)

THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES—HOW IT IS ARRIVED AT—ITS BEARING ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PEOPLE.

THE RESOLUTION.

The resolution concerning ocean freight rates on the staples passed by the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture at its April meeting calls for "proposals which it may see fit to submit on this subject to the general assembly" (May, 1915).

In accordance therewith, and acting under the authority of letter (f) of article 9 of the treaty establishing the institute, which provides that it shall "submit to the approval of the Governments, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers," I propose that the permanent committee introduce the following resolution to the general assembly for adoption.

"The general assembly instructs the International Institute of Agriculture to invite the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of the regulation and control of ocean freight rates on the staples of agriculture.

This conference shall consist of members appointed by each of the Governments adhering to the institute, and is to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and ocean freight rates, said conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the next session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917.

In support of the above resolution I herewith submit the following paper:

TRANSPORTATION AND COMPETITION.

With the ever-increasing importance of transportation as a factor in the economic development and life of nations, Governments everywhere are assuming the right to set aside the competitive system in so far as it concerns the regulation of rates in domestic carriage. Take the case of railways, for instance:

"It was at one time an axiom of law and of political economy that prices should be determined by free competition. But in the development of the railway business it soon became evident that no such dependence on free competition was possible, either in practice or in theory. It produces an uncertainty with regard to rates which prevents stability of prices, and is apt to promote the interests of the unscrupulous speculator at the expense of those whose business methods are more conservative." As a result of these difficulties "operation by private companies, under specific provisions of the Government authorities with regard to the method of its exercise, has been the policy consistently carried out in France," and "there has been both in the United Kingdom and in the United States a progressive increase of legislative interference with railways." (Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 22, pp. 824, 825, 826.)

In recognition of these facts the United States established its Interstate Commerce Commission, with ample power to control its railway traffic rates. In place of leaving the power of rate fixing in the hands of the railway companies, it has vested it in (a) the seven members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, (b) in the railway managers, and (c) in the United States courts, who together form the triune power governing the equities involved in the matter of rates.

SHIPPING RINGS AND MONOPOLIES.

Drawbacks similar to those formerly complained of in railway traffic are now seen to prevail in water carriage. As a result, the abuses alleged in the working of the present system of shipping rings and conferences are attracting the attention of the Governments. Important inquiries on the subject have been held in Great Britain and the United States. In Great Britain a royal commission was appointed, which in 1909 published its report. In the United States a movement is now on foot for extending the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover ocean carriage, both in the domestic and the foreign trade.

In pursuance of this movement resolutions were passed in February and June, 1912, by the United States House of Representatives, of which the following are excerpts:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be, and is hereby, empowered and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of the methods and practices of the various ship lines, both domestic and foreign, engaged in carrying our over-sea or foreign commerce and in the coastwise and inland commerce.

"That said committee shall report to the House all the facts disclosed by said investigation, and what legislation, if any, it deems advisable in relation thereto."

This committee has recently published its report, in four volumes, entitled "Proceedings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the Investigation of Shipping Combinations under House Resolution 587."

I have received these volumes through the courtesy of the chairman, Mr. J. W. ALEXANDER, who in a letter of May 15 informs me that he would be pleased to receive my comments on the same. I therefore now purpose, in order to bring out more clearly the points in favor of my resolution, to comment on the evidence and findings of the committee as set forth in the report.

This report shows that the leading representatives of the commercial interests, and practically all the important navigation companies engaged in the domestic and foreign trade of the United States, gave testimony under oath at the committee's inquiries.

To begin with, the testimony brought out the following facts:

THE FACTS.

First. That the evils arising from former unrestricted competition in ocean carriage have driven the steamship companies to form understandings, conferences, and combinations.

Second. That these understandings, conferences, and combinations have led to the formation of great shipping trusts. These trusts control not only the lines directly owned by them, but also control, to a great extent, the traffic of the "tramp ships," all of which practically gives them a powerful and dangerous monopoly.

Third. That these monopolies give rise to and maintain excessive and unjust rates, and, by the use of "fighting ships" and by rebates to large shippers, tend also to bring forth other and dangerous monopolies—monopolies in buying and monopolies in selling.

As to the first point, the evils of unrestricted competition, the committee, in its "summary of evidence," says:

"Unrestricted competition, based on the survival of the fittest, tends to restrict the development of the lines and in the end must result in monopoly. * * * Competition in the steamship business was regarded as the demoralization rather than the life of trade; as the means of introducing uncertainty instead of certainty and inefficiency instead of efficiency. * * * (Vol. 4, pp. 295, 300.)

On the same point the report furnished the committee by representatives of steamship companies states:

"Competition has never established a reasonable rate nor maintained a stable rate. * * * Rate wars tend to the monopolization of trade by the larger shippers. Unless the warring steamship factions come to some agreement the result is more or less of a monopoly on the part of the most powerful carrier engaged in the conflict." (Vol. 2, p. 1363.)

THE EFFECT.

And now as to the second point, the effect of the understandings, conferences, and combinations entered into by the shipping rings. The American and British reports show that these rings are attaining greater and greater magnitude throughout the world as time goes along. Let me quote an example:

"Practically all the well-known lines connecting north Atlantic American ports with those of the United Kingdom, north Europe, and the Mediterranean are parties to numerous freight agreements covering, in one way or another, nearly every sphere of the American-European trade. * * * over 40 regular trans-Atlantic lines are parties in their respective trades to at least 20 agreements involving the freight traffic, and the important lines are members of at least 4 main freight conferences. The 4 conferences referred to are the trans-Atlantic freight conference, the American Atlantic conference, the Atlantic conference, and the Mediterranean conference." (Vol. 4, p. 59.)

Summarizing the evidence obtained, the committee states in its report:

"It is the almost universal practice for steamship lines engaging in the American foreign trade to operate, both on the inbound and outbound voyages, under the terms of written agreements, conferences, arrangements, or gentlemen's understandings, which have for their principal purpose the regulation of competition through either (1) the fixing or regulation of rates, (2) the apportionment of traffic by allotting the ports of sailing, restricting the number of sailings, or limiting the volume of freight which certain lines may carry, (3) the pooling of earnings from all or a portion of the traffic, or (4) meeting the competition of nonconference lines." (Vol. 4, p. 415.) "Steamship agreements and conferences are not confined to the lines engaging in the foreign trade of the United States. They are as universally used in the foreign trade of other countries as in our own." (Vol. 4, p. 416.)

RATE WARS.

"* * * The methods which have been adopted from time to time to eliminate competition show the futility of a weak line attempting to enter a trade in opposition to the combined power of the established lines when united by agreement. By resorting to the use of the 'fighting ship' or to unlimited rate cutting, the conference lines soon exhaust the resources of their antagonists. By distributing the loss resulting from the rate war over the several members of the conference, each constituent line suffers proportionately a much smaller loss than the one line which is fighting the entire group. Moreover, the federated lines can conduct the competitive struggle with the comfortable assurance that, following the retirement of the competing line, they are in a position to reimburse themselves through an increase in rates." (Vol. 4, p. 304.)

As showing the way in which the shipping rings absorb independent lines and control the ports, let me quote the testimony given before a "hearing" of the committee by one of the witnesses:

"Going back a good many years, there was an independent line from Baltimore to Rotterdam. * * * That line was absorbed and taken over by the Holland-American Line, and instead of Baltimore having an independent service the Baltimore service has been forced out, and we are now dependent on the allotment from the central agency in New York, which says 'Baltimore can do this much business, and we can not do any more.' (Vol. 2, p. 1289.)

THE COMPLAINTS.

And now, finally, for the third point, the excessive and unjust rates and the granting of rebates.

On the question of excessive rise in rates, Mr. J. W. Alexander, the chairman of the committee, stated:

"The testimony before the committee seems to indicate that the ocean rates have gone up from 100 to 200 per cent in the last 12 months, or, anyway, within the last two years." (Vol. 2, p. 801.)

Summarizing certain phases of the evil arising from the formation of shipping rings, the committee states:

"A considerable number of complaints were also filed with the committee objecting to excessive rates, discrimination between shippers in rates and cargo space, indifference to the landing of freight in proper condition, arbitrariness in the settlement of just claims, failure to give due notice to shippers when rates were to be increased, refusal to properly adjust rates as between various classes of commodities, and the unfairness of certain methods, such as 'fighting ships,' deferred rebates, and threats to refuse shipping accommodations, used by some conference lines to meet the competition of nonconference lines. * * * The conference lines so completely dominate the shippers with whom they deal that these shippers can not afford, for fear of retaliation, to place themselves in a position of active antagonism to the lines. * * * (Vol. 4, p. 417.)

On the question of rebates and the monopolies to which they give rise, Mr. HUMPHREY, a member of the committee, pointed out that the shipping conferences give "special rates to certain big interests in the United States, * * * among others, to the Standard Oil, what is known as the Harvester Trust, and what we generally term the Steel Trust." (Vol. 1, p. 267.)

And now let us see, from further evidence in the report, how the case would stand if there were no shipping conferences, if there were no shipping trusts; let us see how it would stand under a régime of open and unrestricted competition.

STABLE RATES.

On this head the contention is made that open competition, with its constantly fluctuating rates, prevents rational calculations of prices in buying and selling, whereas conferences secure stable rates, which permit of such calculations. In its report the committee makes the following statements with reference to the advantages claimed for shipping conferences as against open competition:

"Such agreements, it is contended, are a protection to both shipper and shipowner. To the shipper they insure desired stability of rates. * * * Stability of rates over long periods of time removes the inconvenience which would exist if merchants and shippers were obliged to quote different propositions (prices) on nearly every consignment, thus eliminating what was formerly an undesirable speculative risk under the open competitive system." (Vol. 4, pp. 295, 297.)

"Prominent exporting firms * * * are convinced that the present condition of fixed rates and regular sailing opportunities places all merchants upon the same basis as regards their estimates on contracts, and produces much better results for the exporter and manufacturer than could be possible under the old order of things. * * * (under unrestricted competition) * * * Nothing is regarded so detrimental to the export trade as uncertainty regarding sailings and violent fluctuations in freight rates." (Vol. 4, p. 298.)

Under the shipping conferences "the rates filed are only subject to change after an agreed period of notice, varying from 30 to 60 days. * * * (Vol. 4, p. 64.)

THE DISCREPANCY.

And right here there seems to be a wide discrepancy between the statements just quoted from the committee's report and those contained in letters from the Chambers of Commerce of New York and San Francisco. To facilitate the proposed work of the International Institute of Agriculture in publishing ocean freight rates on the staples, I wrote to some of the leading chambers of commerce in the United States, asking whether the data on current freight rates could be procured for regular publication in the institute's monthly bulletins. The Chamber of Commerce of New York in a communication of December 11, 1913, replied as follows:

"* * * It would be extremely difficult to give any definite information in regard to freights that would be of value in publishing the world's price for cereals. * * * You no doubt are aware that freight rates, particularly for agricultural products, change almost daily, and sometimes several times during the day, depending upon the demand or otherwise for freight room. Rates quoted to-day would be only for refusal for 24 hours, and they are constantly influenced by the fluctuating demand for room in the various steamers. * * * Frequently wheat has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel."

This statement was confirmed by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, which in a letter of April 3 says:

"Rates fluctuate from day to day, and a rate reported to-day might be twice as high or half as low to-morrow."

A similar statement is contained in the report submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries by the representatives of the steamship lines running between New York and foreign countries, which says:

"Ocean freight rates vary not merely from month to month, but from day to day and from hour to hour, especially with reference to the great staples which are traded in on the exchanges." (Vol. 2, p. 1373.)

Thus, in one instance, we are told that the conferences fix rates which can only be changed on 30 or 60 days' notice; whereas the other statement claims that rates fluctuate from day to day and from hour to hour; that "wheat," for instance, "has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and that at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel." How, then, can we reconcile these two and conflicting statements?

THE STAPLES EXCLUDED.

An explanation is seemingly at hand. The shipping conferences exclude the staples of agriculture from their fixed rates. These staples, as we are informed by the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco and New York, are therefore left subject to sudden and violent fluctuations. Their exclusion from the fixed rates is clearly indicated by the following paragraph from the "Summary of Evidence" given in the committee's report, which states:

"The minimum rate agreement, however, does not cover the heavy bulk traffic, consisting of grain, flour, oil cake, cotton, and similar commodities, but is confined to the high-priced freight on which the shippers as well as the ship lines are anxious to have fixed rates equally applicable to all." (Vol. 4, p. 64.)

On this same head Mr. Franklin, vice president of the International Mercantile Co., in his evidence before the committee, says:

"The representatives of the various lines running to Liverpool meet and discuss their rates. * * * These rates are subject to change on certain notice; in some instances 30 days and in some instances 60 days. They cover only certain commodities; they do not cover the great bulk of traffic, which consists of grain, flour, oil cake, cotton, and other bulky commodities. They cover only miscellaneous traffic." (Vol. 1, p. 597.)

We thus see that the case stands as follows: The main freight traffic of a ship is classified under two headings, (a) the "package traffic" and (b) the "bulk traffic." Now, it is to be noted that while fixed rates are given on the merchandise composing the "package traffic" unfixed rates apply to the "bulk traffic," which consists, in the main, of the staples of agriculture.

And the question arises: What proportion does the "package traffic" bear to the "bulk traffic"?

In the testimony given before the committee by the vice president of one of the shipping rings, the International Mercantile Marine Co., it was brought out that of every 9,000 tons of traffic about 2,000 tons are carried as "package freight" at fixed rates and about 7,000 tons as "bulk freight" at unfixed rates, and, as just stated, this "bulk freight" embraces the staples of agriculture. (Vol. 1, p. 611.)

A SIGNIFICANT FACT.

We are thus brought face to face with a significant fact. On the one hand we see the importance attached in the inquiries on ocean

carriage, both in Great Britain and in the United States, to the question of fixed rates for the "package traffic." On the other hand, we see the slurring over, the waiving aside of the question of unfixed rates for "bulk traffic," the traffic which consists mainly in the staples of agriculture. And yet, as is well known, the slightest change in the cost of carriage affects the price of the staples, not only the price of the quantity exported, but likewise so the price of the entire quantity for home use.

This slurring over, this waiving aside, this indifference was noticeable alike in the American and in the British inquiry. And no wonder, for both the inquiries were mainly concerned with points touching ocean freight rates as they affect (a) the public carrier, and (b) the shipper and merchant, whereas the economic influences resulting from the rates and conditions of the ocean carriage of the staples affect most keenly the producers and the consumers.

"GODFATHERS."

From the facts elicited at these inquiries, it would seem as though there are "godfathers," so to speak, on the lookout for all the interests involved excepting for those of the staples. There is a godfather for iron, the Steel Trust; a godfather for agricultural implements, the Harvester Trust; a godfather for oils, the Standard Oil Trust; there is a godfather for the carriers, the shipping rings; a godfather for the commission men and the dealers handling the "package traffic," the chamber of commerce and the board of trade; but there is no godfather for the staples of agriculture, no godfather to represent the interests of the producer and of the consumer.

But the question arises: Would it have made any practical difference to the outcome if the interests of the producer and of the consumer had been represented at these inquiries? Let us see.

It seems to me that, no matter how competent the testimony offered by a body representing the farmers or the consumers, no matter how honest the committee before which such testimony would be given, no matter how able the proposals for legislation which that committee might draft, it would all be ineffective unless the evidence given indicated the international bearing of the subject and unless the findings deduced therefrom recommended action on international lines. So long as the findings would fail to recommend international action they must necessarily fall short of applying adequate means to the ends in view. That this is worthy of serious consideration will be apparent from the following:

WHOM DOES IT CONCERN?

In the case of "package traffic" the terms and conditions of ocean carriage mainly concern the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer. In the case of "bulk traffic," the traffic in the staples of agriculture, the terms and conditions of ocean carriage concern the economic welfare of the people everywhere.

To illustrate: Under "package traffic" whether the rate on shipments of shoes or cutlery, for instance, be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, affects the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer.

But with "bulk traffic" the case is different. In the carriage of the staples of agriculture whether the rate be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, concerns not merely the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer, but it concerns the economic condition of the people everywhere, as will be shown further on.

At this time it would be well to bear in mind that while, on the one hand, "package traffic" comprises that class of merchandise which is bought and sold by private purchase and sale, by private contract, "bulk traffic," on the other hand, comprises, in the main, the staples of agriculture, which are bought and sold in the world's bourses and exchanges at the world's price.

THE WORLD'S PRICE.

And what do we mean when we say the "world's price"?

We mean the price that is tendered and accepted in the world's bourses and exchanges, which we might call the world's auction rooms. And how is this price arrived at?

The first factor in arriving at the world's price is the prevailing opinion as to the state of the world's supply. If the supply be above the normal, the price is expected to fall below the normal; if the supply be below the normal, the price is expected to rise above the normal.

By "supply" we do not mean the quantity produced or available in any one locality, in any one country; we mean the total world's supply. The supply in any given State may be above the normal, and yet if, at the same time, it be below the normal for the world, the price in that State should, nevertheless, be high; or, vice versa, the supply in a given State may be below the normal, yet if the world's supply be above the normal the price in that State should be low.

But the supply is by no means the only factor in the formation of the world's price. There is another factor and an important one—the cost of ocean carriage. If the average cost of ocean carriage be above the normal, it should correspondingly reduce the price paid to the producer below the normal; and, on the contrary, if the average cost of ocean carriage be below the normal, it should correspondingly raise the price paid to the producer above the normal.

Therefore, calculations on rational lines for arriving at a knowledge of what the world's price ought to be should, first of all, take into consideration the status of the world's supply, and, secondly, the status of the cost of ocean carriage.

THE EFFECT OF FIXED RATES.

If there were fixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples, the Liverpool buyer would be able to make offers for given quantities of wheat, for instance, on a basis of rational calculations. But let us take the case as it stands at present. A shipper at Buenos Aires receives an order for wheat to be delivered in Liverpool at the ruling world's price, at, say, \$1 a bushel. How much should he pay for that wheat at Buenos Aires? If the cost of delivery is, say, 10 cents a bushel, the world's price should then be 90 cents a bushel in Buenos Aires. If the cost of delivery is 30 cents, the world's price in Buenos Aires should then be 70 cents. But if he is to ship the wheat in 30 or 60 days' time, how is the shipper to tell what the cost of carriage will then be? As the rates for the ocean carriage of the staples are not fixed, how is he to know? He does not know.

As we have seen, the Chamber of Commerce of New York states that wheat is carried one time free of charge as ballast and at another time at a charge of 10d. and 12d. per bushel; and the San Francisco

Chamber of Commerce writes that "rates fluctuate from day to day, and a rate reported to-day might be twice as high or half as low to-morrow." Therefore the shipper must guess, and so must everyone else guess, so long as rates are unfixed. If the shipper wins on the guess, what he wins comes directly out of the pocket of the producer; if he loses, he tries hard to recoup himself in his next deal, and also out of the producer's pocket.

But this is only the beginning of the mischief. The confusion arising out of the system of unfixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples and the consequent uncertainty in price determining lead to economic evils so far-reaching as to affect the people everywhere.

A comprehensive grasp of the significance of this evil may be obtained by the consideration of the following:

PRIVATE SALE AND PUBLIC SALE.

In the case of "package freight," of chairs, stoves, shoes, etc., the rise or fall in the rates of ocean carriage on the same hardly affects their home price or their foreign price. If, for instance, the cost of ocean carriage on pianos were to advance from \$5 to \$20 each, it need not necessarily follow that owing to the \$15 advance in freight rates all the pianos in the exporting country would decline by \$15 or advance by \$15 in the importing country, for the "package-traffic" merchandise is sold by private contract—by private sale. But with the "bulk freight," with the staples of agriculture, the case is quite different. Being sold on the world's bourses and exchanges at the world's price, it necessarily follows that a rise in ocean freight rates at one or more leading ports of an exporting country, by reducing the price on the quantity exported, must necessarily reduce the price on the remaining quantity in the home market, for the buyer on the bourses or exchanges, whether he buys for export or for home use, pays the same price.

We can thus see how sensitive to change is the world's price and the home price of the staples when influenced by unfixed rates for ocean carriage. Were there fixed rates for the carriage of the staples, subject, say, to 30 or 60 days' notice of change, as is the case with the "package traffic," it would then settle the major evil in the question before us—the evil of constant and unnecessary price disturbances.

RAISE AND LOWER THE PRICE AT WILL.

But apart from such disturbances, under the present system of unfixed rates, there is yet another point which calls for our consideration.

Under present conditions the chief directors of a few of the larger shipping rings by federating their efforts, are in a position to raise and lower, by previous arrangement, the prices of the staples in any and all of the principal ports of the world. Acting under exclusive and advance knowledge of the rates they will charge, they could lower the price of the staples by raising the cost of carriage and then, directly or indirectly, buy them in the bourses. They could then raise the price of the staples by lowering the cost of carriage when they would sell. They could thus, at will and by arrangement, lower the price of the product and buy, then raise the price and sell, and pocket the difference.

But the economic loss occasioned by such raising and lowering of prices at will would be very much greater than the amount the directors of the shipping rings might pocket, for raising or lowering the cost of carriage means raising or lowering the price of the staples on the home market directly and raising or lowering the world's price indirectly.

Besides this species of mischief there is, however, yet another within the power of the federated shipping rings. It is within their power, as we have seen from the case of Baltimore, to make and unmake ports, and, through this, to raise or lower the economic status of the nations; and this power is the more dangerous since such directors of shipping rings are irresponsible and free to act on the lines indicated. They are not expected to be guided by altruistic motives nor by high and statesmanlike political considerations.

"PACKAGE TRAFFIC" AND "BULK TRAFFIC."

Moreover, the fact that the "package traffic," representing 2,000 out of every 9,000 tons, enjoys fixed rates, whilst the "bulk traffic," the traffic in the staples, the traffic that represents 7,000 out of every 9,000 tons, is carried at unfixed rates, is, in itself, a terrible indictment of the present mode of procedure. Here we see that the price of the annual world's production of the staples, the value of which we may roughly estimate at a hundred billion dollars a year, and which represents the foodstuffs and the raw material for clothing and for house furnishing of all the people of the world, is permitted to be battledored and shuttlecocked through the action of the federated shipping rings.

We are thus forced to the conclusion that it is possible under this system for a few powerful directors of federated shipping rings to exert more effective economic control over the nations than can be exerted by any president, emperor, king, or prince; and so long as these federated shipping rings have it in their power to dictate at will the rise and fall in price of the world's food products, of the world's raw materials for clothing and for furnishing, so long do they, in reality, usurp a power which does not belong to them, a power which they should not have.

As matters stand at the present time, the unfixed rates for ocean carriage tend to convert the bourses and exchanges into price storm centers, storm centers which constantly give rise to waves of violent price disturbances, reacting at times in every direction.

Now, what harm do these price disturbances do?

What harm do they not do?

Unfixed rates of ocean carriage for the staples disturb, impede, and throw out of gear the whole mechanism of exchange.

FREE PLAY.

Right here we may aptly borrow the figure of the factory given by President Wilson in his book, "The New Freedom." Here is a workshop: the overhead and underneath shafting, the journals, the pulleys, and the belts are all lined out, true straight, trim, taut, and oiled, and all is well. But if the shafting be sprung or the journals unoled the whole mechanism will be thrown out of gear.

It is just so in the industrial world. The law of competition should be permitted full and free play with no interference to impede its operation. But experience has made it plain over and over again that in the world of industry there is just one field in which competition, if allowed to operate, leads in the end to the "reductio ad absurdum" of the whole competitive system. The field that I refer to is that of transportation; competition in transportation impedes and interferes with the free play of competition in other and important fields.

This fact has been brought home so clearly to the American people that they have enacted laws excluding the railway carriers from the domain of competition by placing the regulation and control of rates in

the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And the same reasoning that holds good for the regulation and control of railroad rates by an Interstate Commerce Commission would, as was shown before, likewise hold good for the regulation and control of ocean carriage through an international commerce commission.

The manner, now arbitrary, now fortuitous, in which the rates for ocean carriage of the staple are fixed; the lightning-like rapidity with which they are made to change; the gravity of the economic disturbances to which such sudden changes give rise; the far-reaching interrelated nature of their effects; the reaction produced by changes of rates in the ports of one nation on prices in the ports of another nation show clearly that if there is reason for placing domestic carriers under national regulation and control, there is yet stronger reason why ocean carriers should be placed under international regulation and control. If this contention be admitted, it then follows that my resolution for an international official conference to consider this matter is in order.

THE SITUATION.

And now let us briefly review the situation as made manifest by the British and American inquiries. We may summarize it as follows:

There are at present two modes of conducting the traffic business of ocean carriage:

- (a) Through unrestricted competition.
- (b) Through shipping rings and conferences.

In the final analysis, however, it would seem that unrestricted competition in ocean carriage is, in reality, but a mere hypothesis, for, as has been shown, such unrestricted competition invariably resolves itself down into a monopoly.

And again, if we examine the shipping rings and conferences which are at present the normal condition, we shall see that this condition also is but another name for monopoly.

We are thus brought face to face with the fact that both unrestricted competition and shipping rings alike lead to monopoly in the business of ocean carriage.

And what about this monopoly? In the American report we find the following:

"All monopolies are liable to abuse, and in our foreign carrying trade the monopoly obtained by the conference lines has not been subjected to any legal control." (Vol. 4, p. 304.)

And on the same head the British report says:

"All monopolies are liable to abuse to a greater or less extent unless they are strictly limited either by the nature of the case, by legislation, or by some form of supervision." (Report of the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings, vol. 1, p. 98.)

And now it will be interesting to note the measures proposed by the American and by the British committees for holding in check this "monopoly," for curbing this "abuse."

BRITISH AND AMERICAN RECOMMENDATIONS.

On the one hand the British commission offers the following recommendation:

"Shippers and merchants in a given trade should form themselves into an association, so that they might be able to present a united front to the conference when any controversy arose." (Report of the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings, vol. 1, p. 85.)

The American committee, on the other hand, recommends:

"That navigation companies, firms, or lines engaged in the foreign trade of the United States be brought under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission as regards the regulation of rates, the approval of contracts entered into with other water carriers, with shippers, or with American railroads." (Vol. 4, p. 419.)

Thus, as we see, the British recommendation is for unofficial, the American for official, action, and both recommendations view the question purely from the national standpoint.

So far as the "package traffic" is concerned, these recommendations might be adequate. But would they cover the needs of the case were the "bulk traffic," the staples of agriculture, under consideration? I do not think so; for as the import, export, and home prices of the staples are governed by the world's price, the formation of which is influenced by the cost of carriage to the principal market centers of the world, and as any one nation is unable to regulate and control the terms and conditions of ocean carriage in the principal world's ports, therefore all attempts to regulate or control ocean carriage of the staples by any one nation must be inadequate.

INTERNATIONAL REGULATION AND CONTROL.

It would therefore seem to me that the nations should consider the advisability of establishing an international commerce commission for the regulation and control of ocean carriage. The influence of such international regulation and control, extending to the principal ports of the world, would supplement the world's official crop reports in guiding the formation of the world's price on an equitable basis. The first division of this work is already being performed; the crop reports now given out by the institute, under the auspices of the nations, are the official and authoritative summary of the world's supply. When this work would be supplemented by that of the international commerce commission it would then permit of rational calculations anywhere as to what the home price of the staples should be in its relation to the world's price.

And right here it may be apposite to relate an incident in the up-building of the institute pertinent to the subject.

Some eight years ago I called on Mr. James Wilson, the then Secretary of Agriculture, in an endeavor to win him over to the needs for an official international crop-reporting service. Mr. Wilson then expressed the opinion that such a service would be of no economic value to the United States. He claimed that the Department of Agriculture had its own crop-reporting service, which was sufficient for the needs of the American people, and that there was no call to enter on some new work which might serve the interests of other nations.

Subsequently, however, Mr. Wilson saw the matter in the light in which it was presented to him. He saw that all the crop reporting that the United States might do would be inadequate for the end in view; that the crop reports of one nation only are inadequate as a basis for arriving at the world's price; for the world's price is based on the world's supply; and in order to have the official reports of the world's supply it is necessary that crop reporting be done by all the nations of the world, and that the reports, and the world's summary of the same, be given out officially at regular intervals under international treaty. When Mr. Wilson saw this he then favored the international institute of Agriculture for this work.

AN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Similarly, in the case of ocean carriage, action by a nation, limited to the regulation and control of the "package traffic" within its own country, can be had through a national institution like the Interstate Commerce Commission. The jurisdiction of such a commission might even be extended to embrace the ocean carriage of a nation at home and abroad; but if all this is intended to influence the equitable relation between the home price and the world's price of the staples it will surely fall far short of accomplishing what is intended. For, as has been shown, one of the principal factors in arriving at the world's price of the staples is a knowledge of the world's supply, and in arriving at a knowledge of what their home price should be in relation to their world's price, the leading factor would be the fixed rates for their ocean carriage. And just as the official report of the world's supply may only be had by means of an international crop-reporting service, so regulation and control of the ocean carriage of the staples may only be had through the medium of an international commerce commission.

Such an international commerce commission could be instituted by the nations under a treaty which should provide for its mode of representation and procedure. If it were granted powers similar to those of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, provision might then be made for it to work in conjunction with a branch of The Hague tribunal, especially constituted and empowered to adjudicate on points of law which might arise out of the commission's functions and decisions. But if its powers were limited to those of a consultative and advisory body, its delegates could then sit in session together with the representatives of the carriers of the shipping interests. The question whether the proposed international commerce commission should be granted powers to act, or whether its functions should be limited to those of a consultative and advisory body, may properly come before the conference called for in my resolution.

FIXED RATES FOR BULK TRAFFIC.

And now it is in order to review some of the objections likely to be raised to fixed rates for "bulk traffic."

The shipowner, for instance, is likely to say, "The unit of transportation by water is the total capacity of a ship. We can not cut off so many feet, as the railroad can, and leave them in New York if we do not want to use them." (Vol. 2, p. 1256.)

It would appear to me that this objection is more seeming than real, for a train of cars can not profitably be run unless there is freight for it, any more than a ship can be run without freight. If you are running a railway you must have freight to fill your cars or get out of business.

"But," it may be asked, "would not such a system of fixed rates overlook the character of the service rendered? Here, for instance, is a costly liner which makes the trip from New York to Liverpool in five days, and here are slower boats, the tramps and the sailing vessels; would the fixed rates apply equally to all?"

And the answer is: The fixed rates could be established according to the quality of the service. Rates could be fixed for first-class, second-class, and third-class service.

The next point that might be raised is that "bulk freight" is a physical necessity for a ship, without which it can not sail, for "the ship must be loaded down to its marks." This being the case, the carrier must be left free to hunt up this "bulk freight" wherever he can get it, and secure it sometimes at a high price, sometimes at a low price.

I believe this objection is also only seemingly valid. The fact is the "bulk freight" either has to be shipped or it does not have to be shipped. If it does not, there will be no use running after it; if it does, then it will come of its own accord.

At this point the carrier is likely to interrupt, saying, "This is all nonsense, for we certainly would have no shiploads if we did not run after the freight, and run after it on the 'give-and-take' method."

And here the carrier is correct; it is all nonsense, so far as conditions are to-day. But would not conditions be different under the proposed international commerce commission, under the proposed fixed rates? With no fixed rates the shrewd shipper of "bulk freight" knows well that at certain times the carrier is bound to tag after him. But with fixed rates for the season the shipper's game would be at an end. He would then always be glad enough to rush to the shipping office and "book" room for freight at the earliest moment possible; all of which would tend to promote the natural and steady flow of freight toward the ships.

THE DIVISION OF LABOR.

"But," says the objector, "would not this proposal to single out the ocean carrier by subjecting him to international control place him at a disadvantage? Would it not materially interfere with his earning power? Would it not reduce his profits?"

I do not think so. I think it can be shown that the adoption of the proposal would be advantageous not only to the producers and the consumers, but also to the carriers.

"How?"

Let us see. By the term "civilization" do we not really mean that cumulative state of progress rendered possible by the division of labor? The savage does everything by himself. He is his own carpenter, his own tailor, his own architect, his own carrier. But, as we know, such work is far inferior to that accomplished under the division of labor.

And this division of labor takes place not only in the handicrafts but also in the field of commerce, in the field of government, and in the field of science. It is, in fact, but another term for "economics." In short, specialization of functions, division of labor, renders effort more effective and more economical. This being so, why not extend the system of the division of labor to the regulation and control of ocean carriage? If the specialization of functions, the division of labor is beneficial, in what field can it be more profitably employed than in this important one of ocean carriage, a field which concerns not only the shipowners but the Governments and the people everywhere?

Fortunately the channels through which the division of labor could be realized in the regulation and control of ocean carriage can readily be made available.

CHANNELS AVAILABLE FOR THE SERVICE.

First of all there could be the proposed international commerce commission, consisting of delegates who should be experts on the subject of ocean carriage. They should be in close official relationship with those departments and bureaus in the various Governments which deal, directly and indirectly, with the questions of internal carriage in their relation to foreign carriage.

In the second place there is the International Institute of Agriculture, which could be officially authorized to place itself in communication in

the several adhering countries with (a) the chambers of commerce and boards of trade, and with (b) the national agricultural organizations, all with the end in view of gathering information toward the synchronization of incoming and outgoing cargoes, said information to be compiled and regularly transmitted to the international commerce commission.

In the third place, a branch of The Hague Tribunal could be constituted and empowered to adjudicate on points of international law which might arise out of the commission's functions and decisions.

It is not difficult to see that all this, when once in operation, would be likely to bring about two important results.

THE PLAY OF FORCES.

First, by promoting the synchronization of incoming and outgoing cargoes it would tend to remove the uncertainties and perplexities which now beset the ocean carrier's business. In short, the focusing of information under the proposed system would make it possible to replace the present unfixed rates for the staples now abnormally low, now again abnormally high, by fixed average rates.

Second, such fixed average rates replacing the present uncertainties, violent fluctuations, and consequent losses would tend toward the more equitable formation of the world's price of the staples, and by steadying that equitable price would promote the economic interests of the people everywhere.

In other words, the adoption of the proposed system would set in motion a play of forces which, beginning in the township with the farmer and his product, working upward through the several channels indicated, thence through the international commerce commission, would tend to normalize the ebb and flow of the economic currents throughout the world of commerce and industry.

THE INTEREST OF THE PRODUCER.

And now we may expect the producer to intervene. "May not unfixed rates, in reality, mean low rates? Has it not been shown that under unfixed rates the carrier is often compelled to transport the staples as ballast free of any charge? Does not this system thus provide the lowest rate? And is it not likely that all this may profit the producer?"

Let us see. If the shipper were to give the producer his share of the difference between the price he actually received and the price he ought to have received whenever the staples were carried as ballast, then the above remarks might to some extent be justified. But how is the shipper, buying as he does in the wheat pit, to hunt up and identify the original owner of the product? And even if the shipper could hunt him up, what would induce him to give back part of his gains to the producer? Nothing that I know of. There is not even a remote chance that the producer will profit by the levy which the shipper raises on the carrier whenever he can compel him to carry freight free as ballast.

The producer's interests can not be served by abnormally low freight rates any more than by abnormally high freight rates; but they can be served by the fixed average rates which the adoption of the proposal here advocated would permit. Such fixed published rates would make it possible for the producer anywhere to arrive at a just approximation of what his home price ought to be in its relation to the world's price, and this would insure to him the best possible results.

But supposing some farmer, working, say, 160 acres of land, were to ask, "Of what value would the adoption of this proposal be to me, since I neither export my product nor sell it to exporters?"

The answer is a simple one; the home price is derived from the world's price, and the world's price is influenced by the cost of ocean carriage. Let the cost of ocean carriage fluctuate through unfixed rates, and it causes the world's price to fluctuate, which, in turn, causes fluctuation of the home price. Steadying the cost of ocean carriage steadies the world's price and steadies the home price of the staples, thus benefiting the farmer who neither exports nor sells to exporters as well as the farmers who export.

THE GOVERNMENTS.

Let us now inquire how the proposal for fixed rates under an international commerce commission would be received by the Governments.

It seems likely that it would be favored by the Governments of the exporting nations, the nations which have the staples of agriculture for sale. But how about the importing nations, the nations that are compelled to buy?

Had this question been asked some 25 years ago, we might have expected the statesman of that day to have given some such answer as the following:

"We are not here as champions of altruism, nor for promoting doctrinaire theories as to equitable distribution. We know what we want. We want foodstuffs and raw materials at the very lowest price at which it may be possible for us to obtain them. The lower our influence can depress the world's price of the staples the better it is for us; the more abundant will be the food of our people and the cheaper will be the raw materials for our factories."

But, with the progress of our times, the statesman of to-day is likely to reason differently; he is likely to answer in this wise:

"We can not afford to force prices in the exporting countries below the normal. Our investments in those countries, the need we have of them as buyers of our manufactured goods, are sufficient inducements to warrant us in using our efforts to influence commerce in the staples along perfectly just and equitable lines, and this both at home and abroad."

THE STATESMAN.

But how will the case stand with those nations which possess a powerful merchant marine? Let us see what the statesman in such a country would have been likely to say some 25 years ago.

"We are not concerned with prices and their equities in foreign countries. In order to conserve and increase our national strength we are primarily concerned in the preservation and development of our merchant marine. We can not, therefore, afford to do anything that would be likely to hamper its freedom or subject its movements to international regulation."

But in our day the answer is likely to be different. The modern statesman is likely to reason:

"While a powerful merchant marine is essential to the well-being of a State, there is another consideration of far greater importance, and that is the well-being of all the people in that State, the well-being of its men, of its women, of its children. Our people must have work; they must eat and wear clothes and furnish their dwellings, and all of this is influenced by stability and equity in the price of the staples. Now, while the merchant marine may force prices in certain markets below their due level, it by no means follows that the products thus lowered will reach the consumers, the people of our State, at that low level. But it is certain that the deteriorating influences set going by

the unfixed rates for ocean carriage, with the speculation they give rise to, will adversely affect not only the producer but also the consumer."

There is yet another phase of the question which the statesman will, no doubt, bear in mind when considering the merchant marine, and that is the need of preserving the economic stability of the colonial possessions of the buying countries. The mother country may be a buyer of the staples; the colonies are almost always sellers. The lamb's gentle bleat will be likely to meet with a sympathetic response from its dam.

THE PROTECTIONIST.

But what will be the opinion of the statesman in a protection country which is neither an extensive exporter nor an importer of the staples?

Twenty-five years ago it is quite likely that such a statesman would have said:

"Yes; I see the wanton waste caused by design or fortuity in forcing the world's price to deflect from the line of the normal through the influences exercised by unfixed rates for the ocean carriage of the staples. It is a grievous injury to many, no doubt. But thanks to our system of protection, and thanks to our independence from the influences exercised by the exporting and importing markets, we are not affected by the evil trend thus imparted. Protection gives us our own special normal, our own price, independent of the world's price."

But the modern statesman is likely to reason:

"Protection is but another name for an artificial barrier. We have the artificial barrier, it is true, but for all that, and above and beyond it, the world's price rules here as it does in every other part of the world. We have the world's price, first of all, and on top of that the artificial enhancement which protection gives to our producers, and which comes out of the pockets of our consumers. It thus follows that we are fully as much interested in maintaining the world's price at its normal level as are the exporting or importing nations."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

In summing up my argument in favor of the resolution, I wish to say that just as the regulation and control of the world's reports on the production of the staples required official international action, so the regulation and control of the terms and conditions for their ocean carriage also requires official international action.

Without such international action there can be no guaranty for equitable and fixed rates in the carriage of the staples. The absence of these equitable and fixed rates must necessarily give rise to disturbances throughout the economic world, by forcing values to deflect from the line of the normal.

In concluding my arguments in favor of the adoption of the resolution, I wish to say that there seem to be three ways of disposing of the question before us. One would be to leave matters alone, to let the problems solve themselves. Another would be to live in the hope that the carriers may presently become so wise and disinterested that they will solve the question of their own accord and set matters right. But if in this matter, as in all others, adequate means are essential to the attainment of rational ends, we are forced to set aside both of these ways. This leaves the third way, that of action on the lines of the resolution submitted, the working out of the system indicated therein.

An impartial review of the subject must lead the statesman to the conclusion that this question can not be solved by action on empirical lines. The problems of ocean carriage as they affect any one port, or all the ports of any one country, are, after all, but phases and fractions, portions of the questions when it is considered as a whole. Viewed as a whole the problems transcend the limits of any one country; they are interrelated and concern all the countries of the world.

The time has passed when the statesman could dismiss this question with a wave of the hand. Population everywhere is increasing by leaps and bounds, and so is popular education. All this is equivalent to saying that wants are increasing. And it is clear that the highest aim of good statesmanship is to see that the demands arising out of these increased wants are not stupidly and unjustly frustrated by causes which have their root in inequities in the formation of the world's price of the staples.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, to my mind this resolution is a movement in the right direction. To anyone who has made even a cursory study of ocean rates on farm products, it is at once evident that something should be done to steady or make more stable these rates. As it is, to-day, one who wishes to calculate the price of a staple farm product in any State of the Union, the price of the product being set by some foreign market, is unable to do so for the reason that one of the principal elements that determines the local market price is unknown, namely, the cost of ocean carriage. If one wishes to know to-day in Iowa, in Minnesota, in South Dakota, or in North Dakota the price that wheat should bring in any town in one of these States, he first ascertains the price in Liverpool, the market that sets the price of wheat for the world. To determine the local market price of wheat of any staple farm product whose price is dependent upon the foreign market, it is at once clear that one must deduct from the foreign market price the cost of carriage from the local market to the foreign market. To determine the price of wheat in any local market one would naturally first inquire the cost of carriage from the local market to the seaboard. This is readily ascertained, and is found to be a certain fixed and definite cost, which in this country is now subject to change only after approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission and after from 30 to 90 days' notice being given to the public.

Next in order, it is necessary to know the cost of ocean carriage from the seaboard to Liverpool. Strange as it may seem,

this is found not to be possible of ascertainment with any degree of certainty, for all ocean rates for bulk products under the present methods and under present shipping practice are subject to wide variations without notice to the shipper from day to day and even from hour to hour.

While under the present methods of shipping staple farm products overseas it may cost 5 cents a bushel to ship wheat from New York to Liverpool on one day or during a given week, it may cost 10 cents a bushel to ship wheat from New York to Liverpool the next day or during the next week, and then, again, the following day or during the following week wheat may be shipped from New York to Liverpool for 1 cent a bushel, or even for a much lower rate than this.

Since the cost of carriage from the seaboard to Liverpool can not be ascertained by the buyer in the local market, the price that should be paid for wheat in the local market can not be accurately determined. As a consequence the buyer in the local market, to be on the safe side, usually calculates the rate of carriage from the seaboard to Liverpool at the maximum rate charged and deducts this and the cost of transportation from the local market to the seaboard from the Liverpool price of wheat, making the remainder a local market price to be paid to the producer.

For illustration, if the market price of wheat in Liverpool is \$1, to determine the local price of wheat in Minneapolis, Minn., there must be deducted from the Liverpool price the cost of carriage from Minneapolis to New York, the seaboard, and the cost of ocean carriage from New York to Liverpool. While the cost of carriage from Minneapolis to New York can be accurately ascertained, the cost of ocean carriage from New York to Liverpool is an unknown and uncertain factor. Consequently, the maximum rate of carriage that at times may be exacted from New York to Liverpool is calculated, and the price of wheat in the local market in Minneapolis determined to a large extent thereby. In this way the seller on the Minneapolis market, who is the real producer of the grain, fails to receive the benefit of ocean rates less than the maximum rate at times charged between New York and Liverpool.

The fact that ocean carriage on staple farm products can be raised or lowered at a moment's notice, and at the whim and will of the shipping rings and combinations, leaves room for tremendous gambling operations on grain prices and levies each year heavy tolls on both the producer and the consumer.

As a consequence of the many abuses prevailing in water-rate carriage, both in domestic and foreign commerce, due to shipping conferences, rings, and monopolies, important inquiries have been made during the past few years, both in Great Britain and in the United States. A royal commission appointed in Great Britain made and published an exhaustive report on this subject in 1909. During the Sixty-second Congress the House of Representatives on July 16, 1912, passed House resolution No. 578, which was introduced on June 16, 1912, by Mr. ALEXANDER, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The following are the first two sections of this resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be, and is hereby, empowered and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of the methods and practices of the various ship lines, both domestic and foreign, engaged in carrying our overseas or foreign commerce and in the coastwise and inland commerce, and the connection between such ship lines and railroads and other common carriers, and between such lines and forwarding, ferry, towing, dock, warehouse, lighterage, or other terminal companies or firms or transportation agencies, and to investigate whether any such ship lines have formed any agreements, understandings, working arrangements, conferences, pools, or other combinations among one another, or with railroads or other common carriers, or with any of the companies, firms, or transportation agencies referred to in this section, for the purpose of fixing rates and tariffs, or of giving and receiving rebates, special rates, or other special privileges or advantages, or for the purpose of pooling or dividing their earnings, losses, or traffic, or for the purpose of preventing or destroying competition; also to investigate as to what methods, if any, are used by such ship lines, foreign or domestic, and railroads and other common carriers, or of any of the companies, firms, or other transportation agencies referred to in this section, to prevent the publication of their methods, rates, and practices in the United States; also to investigate and report to what extent and in what manner any foreign nation has subsidized or may own any vessels engaged in our foreign commerce; also to investigate and report to what extent any vessel lines and companies or any of the companies, firms, or transportation agencies referred to in this section, engaged in our foreign or coastwise or inland commerce, are owned or controlled by railway companies, by other ship lines or companies, or by any of the companies, firms, or transportation agencies referred to in this section, or by the same interests and persons owning or controlling railroad companies, ship lines, or other common carriers, or any of the companies, firms, or transportation agencies referred to in this section; and said committee shall further investigate whether the conduct or methods or practices of said foreign steamship lines are in contravention of our commercial treaties or in violation of our laws, and what effect said methods and practices have on the commerce and freight rates of the United States; and shall further investigate what effect such combinations, agreements, understandings, working arrangements, and practices of railroads and our coastwise and inland shipping lines, or of railroads and such shipping lines and any of the companies, firms,

or transportation agencies referred to in this section, or of railroads and overseas shipping lines, whether domestic or foreign, if any are found to exist, have on the commerce and freight rates of the United States, and whether the same are in violation of the laws of the United States.

Sec. 2. That said committee shall report to the House all the facts disclosed by said investigation and what legislation, if any, it deems advisable in relation thereto.

Under authority of this resolution the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries made a very full investigation of water rates of transportation and of the existing shipping combinations, conferences, and monopolies. The hearings held before the committee, the committee's recommendations and conclusions, and all proceedings had under authority of the resolution are contained in a published report consisting of four volumes. Much very valuable material on the subject of both foreign and domestic water rates is contained in this report.

Ocean freight traffic is commonly classified under two headings: First, "Package traffic"; second, "Bulk traffic." The latter classification includes grain, flour, oil cake, cotton, and other bulky commodities. From the extensive hearings held under the authority of House resolution No. 587, to which I have just referred, it appears that of the ocean freight tonnage carried about two-ninths consists of "package traffic" and about seven-ninths of "bulk traffic."

The testimony of Mr. Franklin, vice president of the International Mercantile Marine Co., of New York, before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, as well as the testimony of others, disclosed that while there are fixed rates on "package traffic," which rates can not be changed without from 30 to 60 days' notice to those engaged in shipping, there are no fixed or certain rates on "bulk traffic."

This condition gives to the federated shipping interests a most dangerous power. There is no good reason or argument that can be advanced as to why the "package traffic" consisting of but two-ninths of the freight shipments should enjoy fixed rates, while the "bulk traffic" making up seven-ninths of the freight shipments has no fixed rates. Because this condition prevails the federated shipping interests and other gamblers in the price of the staples, the value of which is estimated to be a hundred billion dollars a year, and which represents the foodstuffs and raw materials for clothing and household furnishings of all the people of all the world, hold the power to dictate at will the rise and fall in the price of the world's agricultural products. This power has long since been recognized as one of the most important factors in connection with railroad transportation in this country, and the control and regulation of rates on "bulk traffic" as well as "package traffic" has been wisely and properly placed in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Since the import, export, and home price of the staples of agriculture are governed by the world's price, the formation of which is, as I have before suggested, influenced by the cost of carriage from the local market to the principal market centers of the world, and as no one nation is able to regulate and control the terms and conditions of ocean carriage of the principal world ports, any successful attempts to regulate or control ocean carriage of staples must necessarily be made through an international organization, such as the International Institute of Agriculture.

This House joint resolution, which I am informed has the earnest approval and indorsement of Hon. David Lubin, the very able and learned permanent delegate of the United States to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, and which is in the following terms:

Resolved, etc., That in accordance with the authority of letter (f) of article 9 of the treaty establishing the institute, which provides that it shall "submit to the approval of the Governments, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers," the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture is hereby instructed to present (during the 1914 fall sessions) to the permanent committee the following resolutions; to the end that they may be submitted for action at the general assembly in 1915, so as to permit the proposed conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917:

RESOLUTIONS.

"The general assembly instructs the International Institute of Agriculture to invite the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of steadying the world's price of the staples.

"This conference shall consist of members appointed by each of the Governments adhering to the institute, and is to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and on ocean freight rates, with consultative, deliberative, and advisory powers.

"Said conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917."

Will, in my judgment, if passed by this Congress, set in motion the machinery necessary to bring together a conference of the nations of the world which will evolve and adopt practical

means and methods of controlling, regulating, and making stable the ocean rates on all ocean freight traffic.

The International Institute of Agriculture at Rome since its establishment by convention entered into on June 7, 1905, has done lasting and valuable work for the interest of the farmers of the world through its weekly and monthly authentic world crop reports made to the countries signatory to the convention and, through them, to the public. Due to the work being carried on by this international institute, reliable statistics of the world's agricultural products are to-day made easily available to every farmer and to every business man. The diffusion of this information has been a large factor in steadying the price of agricultural products. Fifty-four nations are now signatories to the international convention which founded the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. If the support of these nations through the International Institute of Agriculture can be secured to an agreement for the establishment of an international commerce commission vested with power to regulate or stabilize ocean freight rates on the staples of agriculture, another most important factor in steadying the world's price of farm products will be fixed and another large element of speculation will be eliminated. The spirit as well as the substance embodied in this resolution should, in my judgment, be accorded the support of every man on the floor of this Chamber. This is not a party measure. It is more than a national question. It is an international problem which in no uncertain measure affects the living and the welfare of the masses of the people of all the world. I trust the resolution may soon be adopted by the Congress, and that it may be successful in accomplishing the good work its author purposes it to accomplish. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann]. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I heard the testimony given by Mr. David Lubin, and by other thoroughly informed witnesses, as to the merits of this resolution, and I am convinced that it ought to pass. The facts are very simple. Seven-ninths of the entire ocean traffic is what is called bulk traffic, and practically all of this comes from the farms of the country. When farm products are carried on land the farmers know precisely what the freight rate is. And the railroads can not change that freight rate without first giving notice of 30 or 60 days; and even then they can not change it without the consent of the commission, which before reaching a decision takes into account the interests of the railroads and the interests of the shippers. Whereas ocean freight rates on grain, as was shown by the testimony, may vary in an hour from 1 cent to 25 cents a bushel. This resolution simply provides as its ultimate purpose that the International Institute of Agriculture shall call an international conference to consider the subject of steadying the world's price of the staples of agriculture and the advisability of establishing an international commerce commission on merchant marine with advisory and consultative powers concerning the rates to be paid on ocean traffic. It is a resolution of great importance, and I hope that it will pass without a dissenting vote. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Nine minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I assume that this resolution will pass, but I do not believe it will do any good. It may do some harm. It will apparently put the Government of the United States on record in favor of stability of ocean freight rates. There is one way to have stable ocean rates, and that is to have comparatively high rates and to cut out competition. Ocean rates have been reduced from time to time for many years, gradually falling, with some variation—

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No. I have but 9 minutes and the gentleman had 10. I hope I may be permitted to make this suggestion, and then, if the gentleman desires to ask a question, I will be glad to yield.

There is a competition in ocean freight rates, notwithstanding all that has been said. If all the regular line steamers are in combination, that still does not affect the tramp vessels. It has not been unusual for the tramp steamer or the tramp sailing vessel to come into a port looking for a cargo. They go where they think the cargoes will be, and the rate which they charge will depend upon the demand for cargo space. When we have a large quantity of exports from a particular place the rate will keep up. When there is a supply of vessels and a shortage

of demand, the rate will fall. The freight rate on grains from the West to the East has been reduced to a very large percentage by lake competition. Lake competition has been such in the past—and it usually takes some time to have a complete effect upon railroad rates—lake competition has been such in the past that frequently steamers have carried grain from Chicago to Buffalo for a cent a bushel. Competition did it. If you had had an interstate commerce commission fixing rates, there would have been no rate fixed as low as that. That does not pay interest on the investment. But when the supply is large in the way of cargo space and the demand is small, the shipper makes his own terms.

Now, gentlemen say that this does not benefit the farmer any. All of the various circumstances that enter into prices for and against lower or higher prices meet together on the Chicago Board of Trade as to corn and wheat and other grain, and at other places accordingly, and the consensus of all the combinations bring out the price.

To-day we are met with a peculiar situation which itself shows that the statements of Mr. Lubin and those of the committee on this joint resolution are in error. They say that the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool, and that the farmer can not tell what price he is going to get, because we have not stable ocean rates, but that if the farmer knew what the ocean rate was he could tell exactly what his wheat was worth in Kansas City or on the farm by subtracting from the Liverpool price the rate.

A little while ago wheat was 80 cents a bushel, with a large crop in this country. Every grain speculator in the land believed there would be a reduction in the price of wheat. The European war broke out. The newspapers throughout the country published the fact that grain would increase in price, that there would be a great demand for wheat and flour in Europe. The members of the Chicago Board of Trade rather laughed at the idea that it would be possible to largely put up the price of wheat in the face of the exceedingly large crop and the lack of vessels to ship the wheat abroad.

But what have been the facts? The people throughout the country, fearing that there would be an increase in the price of flour, bought two barrels of flour where they bought one barrel before, or bought one barrel of flour where they bought a sack before. There has been more flour sold in this country in the last 30 days than was ever sold before in the country in 40 days' time or more.

The millers met the demand for flour—how? They have to have wheat. But the farmers were holding their wheat back. They were not paying any attention to the Liverpool quotations, nor to the freight rate from here to Liverpool. They held their wheat back, and wheat has gone up 25 cents a bushel in a month's time—more than that for May wheat—thus disproving every assertion which the economists have made for years, or which many of the economists have made, and which the committee make in reference to this proposition.

Now, it is to the interest of the farmers to have cheap ocean rates. I have given as much attention to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the interstate-commerce law as any Member on this floor. I said years ago that the interstate-commerce law, when we gave the Interstate Commerce Commission full power over rates, would stabilize rates, but that it would increase rates. You never can stabilize rates anywhere without a gradual increase in the rates.

Now, the people of our country, in close competition with each other in different sections and different cities, desired stable rates, because unstable rates gave one city in competition with another an advantage over the other. But when it comes to foreign rates we would rather have cheap rates than stable rates. When grain is carried across the Atlantic Ocean for nothing as ballast, as has been the case on many occasions, that very fact puts up the price of grain to the farmer in this country.

Mr. Lubin desires that the farmer may know, as he says, what he is going to get, but will fix it so that he will get less money. My belief is that the farmer would rather have a little more money and not know in advance just how much it is. The farmer deals with uncertainties as to his crops. He does not know how much wheat he is going to have. He would rather have a larger amount of money at the end of the season than to know, to begin with, just how much he would have.

The effect of this resolution, if it amounts to anything, is to put the Congress on record as favoring the proposition that we will have high ocean rates, but we shall know what they are, and that a tramp steamer coming into port can not carry wheat or corn or cotton for any less than any other steamer can carry it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution. I have had a pleasure of reading over the hearings and also of hearing the statements and presentation of the matter by Mr. Lubin a number of times. No one who has heard his personal presentation of the matter, knowing the questions involved and their magnitude, and what it means to the farmers of this country, can deny that it is the most convincing argument ever made or written. These arguments are based on experience and, we believe, the facts. A stable freight rate over the ocean or a steadying of the rates would mean that the farmer and the producer of seven-ninths of all the commodities used in the world that are transported by freight would reap the benefit, and he would know exactly what he was going to get. He would not be subjected to gambling in the markets in fixing the rates.

The International Institute of Agriculture, having its seat at Rome, Italy, is a permanent Government institution created by treaties signed June 7, 1905, between the United States and the following powers: Italy, Montenegro, Russia, Argentine Republic, Roumania, Servia, Belgium, Salvador, Portugal, Mexico, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Persia, Japan, Ecuador, Bulgaria, Denmark, Spain, France, Sweden, the Netherlands, Greece, Uruguay, Germany, Cuba, Austria-Hungary, Norway, Egypt, Great Britain, Guatemala, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Brazil, Costa Rica, Chile, Peru, China, Paraguay, and Turkey. Since the creation of the institute 14 other powers have become adherents, making the total number at this time 54 nations represented in the institution.

Confining its operations within an international sphere, the institute is authorized and directed, among other things, to submit to the approval of the Governments, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers, and it is under the subsection designated "f," article 9 of the treaty referred to, that it is proposed to instruct the American delegate to offer a resolution inviting the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of steadying the world's price of the staple agricultural products.

If the invitation thus extended is accepted, a conference consisting of delegates or members named by each of the adhering Governments will meet in Rome to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and on ocean freight rates, with consultative, deliberative, and advisory powers.

Hearings were held on the resolution, and the testimony taken developed the following facts:

That of the entire ocean freight traffic, seven-ninths consist of bulk traffic, the greater proportion of which is the staples of agriculture.

That two-ninths of the total ocean freight traffic consist of package traffic, including practically all manufactured articles.

That while the freight rate on package traffic can not be changed by the carriers without giving 30 to 60 days' notice to shippers, the rate on bulk traffic may be, and in fact is, changed without notice and fluctuates hourly.

That the domestic price of the staples of agriculture is governed by the export price, which fluctuates with the rise and fall of ocean freight rates on bulk traffic.

That the world's price of the staples of agriculture can not be steadied until a fixed rate can be established on bulk traffic the same as package traffic.

Independent of the abnormal conditions which now obtain, the ocean freight rates have increased within the past two years from 100 to 200 per cent and are controlled absolutely by a shipping trust which arbitrarily fixes the charge for carrying the staple commodities, and the burden of increased rates has been borne largely by the bulk traffic. The broad, international scope of the question is patent and it is one of primary importance to every agricultural nation in the world.

The following paper submitted by Mr. Lubin before the Committee on Foreign Affairs fully justifies the passage of this resolution:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE—PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE REGULATION AND CONTROL OF OCEAN CARRIAGE BY MEANS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE COMMISSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF STEADYING THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES. (By David Lubin, delegate of the United States International Institute of Agriculture, Rome, Italy.)

THE WORLD'S PRICE OF THE STAPLES—HOW IT IS ARRIVED AT—ITS BEARING ON THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE PEOPLE.

THE RESOLUTION.

The resolution concerning ocean freight rates on the staples passed by the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture

at its April meeting calls for "proposals which it may see fit to submit on this subject to the general assembly" (May, 1915).

In accordance therewith, and acting under the authority of letter (f) of article 9 of the treaty establishing the institute, which provides that it shall "submit to the approval of the Government, if there be need, measures for the protection of the common interests of farmers," I propose that the permanent committee introduce the following resolution to the general assembly for adoption.

The general assembly instructs the International Institute of Agriculture to invite the adhering Governments to participate in an international conference on the subject of the regulation and control of ocean freight rates on the staples of agriculture.

This conference shall consist of members appointed by each of the Governments adhering to the institute, and is to consider the advisability of formulating a convention for the establishment of a permanent international commerce commission on merchant marine and ocean freight rates. Said conference to be held in Rome during the fortnight preceding the next session of the general assembly of the institute in 1917.

In support of the above resolution I herewith submit the following paper:

TRANSPORTATION AND COMPETITION.

With the ever-increasing importance of transportation as a factor in the economic development and life of nations, governments everywhere are assuming the right to set aside the competitive system in so far as it concerns the regulation of rates in domestic carriage. Take the case of railways, for instance.

"It was at one time an axiom of law and of political economy that prices should be determined by free competition. But in the development of the railway business it soon became evident that no such dependence on free competition was possible, either in practice or in theory. It produces an uncertainty with regard to rates which prevents stability of prices, and is apt to promote the interests of the unscrupulous speculator at the expense of those whose business methods are more conservative." As a result of these difficulties "operation by private companies, under specific provisions of the Government authorities with regard to the method of its exercise, has been the policy consistently carried out in France," and "there has been both in the United Kingdom and in the United States a progressive increase of legislative interference with railways." (Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. 22, pp. 824, 825, 826.)

In recognition of these facts the United States established its Interstate Commerce Commission with ample power to control its railway traffic rates. In place of leaving the power of rate fixing in the hands of the railway companies, it has vested it in (a) the seven members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, (b) in the railway managers, and (c) in the United States courts, who together form the triune power governing the equities involved in the matter of rates.

SHIPPING RINGS AND MONOPOLIES.

Drawbacks similar to those formerly complained of in railway traffic are now seen to prevail in water carriage. As a result, the abuses alleged in the working of the present system of shipping rings and conferences are attracting the attention of the Governments. Important inquiries on the subject have been held in Great Britain and the United States. In Great Britain a royal commission was appointed which, in 1909, published its report. In the United States a movement is now on foot for extending the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to cover ocean carriage, both in the domestic and the foreign trade.

In pursuance of this movement resolutions were passed in February and June, 1912, by the United States House of Representatives, of which the following are excerpts:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be, and is hereby, empowered and directed to make a complete and thorough investigation of the methods and practices of the various ship lines, both domestic and foreign, engaged in carrying our over-sea or foreign commerce and in the coastwise and inland commerce.

"That said committee shall report to the House all the facts disclosed by said investigation, and what legislation, if any, it deems advisable in relation thereto."

This committee has recently published its report, in four volumes, entitled "Proceedings of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the Investigation of Shipping Combinations under House resolution 587."

I have received these volumes through the courtesy of the chairman, Mr. J. W. ALEXANDER, who, in a letter of May 15, informs me that he would be pleased to receive my comments on the same. I therefore now purpose, in order to bring out more clearly the points in favor of my resolution, to comment on the evidence and findings of the committee as set forth in the report.

This report shows that the leading representatives of the commercial interests, and practically all the important navigation companies engaged in the domestic and foreign trade of the United States, gave testimony under oath at the committee's inquiries.

To begin with, the testimony brought out the following facts:

THE FACTS.

First That the evils arising from former unrestricted competition in ocean carriage have driven the steamship companies to form understandings, conferences, and combinations.

Second That these understandings, conferences, and combinations have led to the formation of great shipping trusts. These trusts control not only of lines directly owned by them, but also control, to a great extent, the traffic of the "tramp ships," all of which practically gives them a powerful and dangerous monopoly.

Third That these monopolies give rise to and maintain excessive and unjust rates, and, by the use of "fighting ships" and by rebates to large shippers, tend also to bring forth other and dangerous monopolies—monopolies in buying and monopolies in selling.

As to the first point, the evils of unrestricted competition, the committee, in its "summary of evidence," says:

"Unrestricted competition, based on the survival of the fittest, tends to restrict the development of the lines and in the end must result in monopoly. * * * Competition in the steamship business was regarded as the demoralization rather than the life of trade; as the means of introducing uncertainty instead of certainty, and inefficiency instead of efficiency. * * * (Vol. 4, pp. 295, 300.)

On the same point the report furnished the committee by representatives of steamship companies states:

"Competition has never established a reasonable rate nor maintained a stable rate. * * * Rate wars tend to the monopolization of trade by the larger shippers. Unless the warring steamship factions come to some agreement the result is more or less of a monopoly on the part of the most powerful carrier engaged in the conflict." (Vol. 2, p. 1393.)

THE EFFECT.

And now as to the second point, the effect of the understandings, conferences, and combinations entered into by the shipping rings. The American and British reports show that these rings are attaining greater and greater magnitude throughout the world as time goes along. Let me quote an example:

"Practically all the well-known lines connecting North Atlantic American ports with those of the United Kingdom, North Europe, and the Mediterranean are parties to numerous freight agreements covering in one way or another nearly every sphere of the American-European trade. . . . over 40 regular trans-Atlantic lines are parties in their respective trades to at least 20 agreements involving the freight traffic, and the important lines are members of at least four main freight conferences. The four conferences referred to are the trans-Atlantic Freight Conference, the American Atlantic Conference, the Atlantic Conference, and the Mediterranean Conference." (Vol. 4, p. 50.)

Summarizing the evidence obtained, the committee states in its report:

"It is the almost universal practice for steamship lines engaging in the American foreign trade to operate, both on the inbound and outbound voyages, under the terms of written agreements, conferences, arrangements, or gentlemen's understandings, which have for their principal purpose the regulation of competition through either (1) the fixing or regulation of rates, (2) the apportionment of traffic by allotting the ports of sailing, restricting the number of sailings, or limiting the volume of freight which certain lines may carry, (3) the pooling of earnings from all or a portion of the traffic, or (4) meeting the competition of nonconference lines." (Vol. 4, p. 415.) "Steamship agreements and conferences are not confined to the lines engaging in the foreign trade of the United States. They are as universally used in the foreign trade of other countries as in our own." (Vol. 4, p. 416.)

RATE WARS.

"* * * The methods which have been adopted from time to time to eliminate competition show the futility of a weak line attempting to enter a trade in opposition to the combined power of the established lines when united by agreement. By resorting to the use of the 'fighting ship' or to unlimited rate cutting, the conference lines soon exhaust the resources of their antagonists. By distributing the loss resulting from the rate war over the several members of the conference, each constituent line suffers proportionately a much smaller loss than the one line which is fighting the entire group. Moreover, the federated lines can conduct the competitive struggle with the comfortable assurance that, following the retirement of the competing line, they are in a position to reimburse themselves through an increase in rates." (Vol. 4, p. 304.)

As showing the way in which the shipping rings absorb independent lines and control the ports, let me quote the testimony given before a "hearing" of the committee by one of the witnesses:

"Going back a good many years, there was an independent line from Baltimore to Rotterdam. . . . That line was absorbed and taken over by the Holland-American Line; and instead of Baltimore having an independent service, the Baltimore service has been forced out, and we are now dependent on the allotment from the central agency in New York, which says 'Baltimore can do this much business,' and we can not do any more." (Vol. 2, p. 1289.)

THE COMPLAINTS.

And now, finally, for the third point: The excessive and unjust rates and the granting of rebates.

On the question of excessive rates in rates Mr. J. W. ALEXANDER, the chairman of the committee, stated:

"The testimony before the committee seems to indicate that the ocean rates have gone up from 100 to 200 per cent in the last 12 months, or, anyway, within the last two years." (Vol. 2, p. 801.)

Summarizing certain phases of the evil arising from the formation of shipping rings, the committee states:

"A considerable number of complaints were also filed with the committee objecting to excessive rates, discrimination between shippers in rates and cargo space, indifference to the landing of freight in proper condition, arbitrariness in the settlement of just claims, failure to give due notice to shippers when rates were to be increased, refusal to properly adjust rates as between various classes of commodities, and the unfairness of certain methods, such as 'fighting ships,' deferred rebates, and threats to refuse shipping accommodations used by some conference lines to meet the competition of nonconference lines. . . . The conference lines so completely dominate the shippers with whom they deal that these shippers can not afford, for fear of retaliation, to place themselves in a position of active antagonism to the lines. . . ." (Vol. 4, p. 417.)

On the question of rebates and the monopolies to which they give rise, Mr. HEMPHREY, a member of the committee, pointed out that the shipping conferences give "special rates to certain big interests in the United States. . . . among others to the Standard Oil, what is known as the Harvester Trust, and what we generally term the 'Steel Trust.'" (Vol. 1, p. 267.)

And now let us see from further evidence in the report how the case would stand if there were no shipping conferences, if there were no shipping trusts: let us see how it would stand under a régime of open and unrestricted competition.

STABLE RATES.

On this head the contention is made that open competition with its constantly fluctuating rates prevents rational calculations of prices in buying and selling, whereas conferences secure stable rates which permit of such calculations. In its report the committee makes the following statements with reference to the advantages claimed for shipping conferences as against open competition.

"Such agreements, it is contended, are a protection to both shipper and shipowner. To the shipper they insure desired stability of rates. . . . Stability of rates over long periods of time removes the inconvenience which would exist if merchants and shippers were obliged to quote different propositions (prices) on nearly every consignment, thus eliminating what was formerly an undesirable speculative risk under the open competitive system." (Vol. 4, pp. 295, 297.)

"Prominent exporting firms. . . . are convinced that the present condition of fixed rates and regular sailing opportunities places all merchants upon the same basis as regards their estimates on contracts, and produces much better results for the exporter and manufacturer than could be possible under the old order of things. . . . (under unrestricted competition). . . . Nothing is regarded so detrimental to the export trade as uncertainty regarding sailings and violent fluctuations in freight rates." (Vol. 4, p. 298.)

Under the shipping conferences "the rates filed are only subject to change after an agreed period of notice, varying from 30 to 60 days. . . ." (Vol. 4, p. 64.)

THE DISCREPANCY.

And right here there seems to be a wide discrepancy between the statements just quoted from the committee's report and those contained in letters from the Chambers of Commerce of New York and of San Francisco. To facilitate the proposed work of the International Institute of Agriculture in publishing ocean freight rates on the staples, I wrote to some of the leading chambers of commerce in the United States, asking whether the data on current freight rates could be procured for regular publication in the institute's monthly bulletins. The Chamber of Commerce of New York, in a communication of December 11, 1913, replied as follows:

"* * * It would be extremely difficult to give any definite information in regard to freights that would be of value in publishing the world's price for cereals. . . . You no doubt are aware that freight rates, particularly for agricultural products, change almost daily and sometimes several times during the day, depending upon the demand or otherwise for freight room. Rates quoted to-day would be only for refusal for 24 hours, and they are constantly influenced by the fluctuating demand for room in the various steamers. . . . Frequently wheat has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel."

This statement was confirmed by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, which, in a letter of April 3, says:

"Rates fluctuate from day to day, and a rate reported to-day might be twice as high or half as low to-morrow."

A similar statement is contained in the report submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries by the representatives of the steamship lines running between New York and foreign countries, which says:

"Ocean freight rates vary not merely from month to month, but from day to day and from hour to hour, especially with reference to the great staples which are traded in on the exchanges." (Vol. 2, p. 1373.)

Thus, in one instance, we are told that the conferences fix rates which can only be changed on 30 or 60 days' notice; whereas the other statement claims that rates fluctuate from day to day and from hour to hour; that "wheat," for instance, "has been carried between the United States and London free of any charge, being simply used for ballast in the steamers, and that at other times the rate has advanced to 10d. and 12d. per bushel." How, then, can we reconcile these two and conflicting statements?

THE STAPLES EXCLUDED.

An explanation is seemingly at hand. The shipping conferences exclude the staples of agriculture from their fixed rates. These staples, as we are informed by the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco and New York, are therefore left subject to sudden and violent fluctuations. Their exclusion from the fixed rates is clearly indicated by the following paragraph from the "Summary of Evidence" given in the committee's report, which states:

"The minimum rate agreement, however, does not cover the heavy bulk traffic, consisting of grain, flour, oil cake, cotton, and similar commodities, but is confined to the high-priced freight on which the shippers as well as the ship lines are anxious to have fixed rates equally applicable to all." (Vol. 4, p. 64.)

On this same head Mr. Franklin, vice president of the International Mercantile Co., in his evidence before the committee, says:

"The representatives of the various lines running to Liverpool meet and discuss their rates. . . . These rates are subject to change on certain notice: in some instances 30 days and in some instances 60 days. They cover only certain commodities; they do not cover the great bulk of traffic which consists of grain, flour, oil cake, cotton, and other bulky commodities. They cover only miscellaneous traffic." (Vol. 1, p. 597.)

We thus see that the case stands as follows: The main freight traffic of a ship is classified under two headings, (a) the "package traffic" and (b) the "bulk traffic." Now it is to be noted that while fixed rates are given on the merchandise composing the "package traffic" unfixed rates apply to the "bulk traffic," which consists in the main of the staples of agriculture.

And the question arises: What proportion does the "package traffic" bear to the "bulk traffic"?

In the testimony given before the committee by the vice president of one of the shipping rings, the International Mercantile Marine Co., it was brought out that of every 9,000 tons of traffic about 2,000 tons are carried as "package freight" at fixed rates, and about 7,000 tons as "bulk freight" at unfixed rates, and, as just stated, this "bulk freight" embraces the staples of agriculture. (Vol. 1, p. 611.)

A SIGNIFICANT FACT.

We are thus brought face to face with a significant fact. On the one hand we see the importance attached in the inquiries on ocean carriage, both in Great Britain and in the United States, to the question of fixed rates for the "packing traffic." On the other hand we see the shuffling over, the waiving aside of the question of unfixed rates for "bulk traffic," the traffic which consists mainly in the staples of agriculture. And yet, as is well known, the slightest change in the cost of carriage affects the price of the staples, not only the price of the quantity exported, but likewise so the price of the entire quantity for home use.

This shuffling over, this waiving aside, this indifference, was noticeable alike in the American and in the British inquiry. And no wonder, for both the inquiries were mainly concerned with points touching ocean freight rates as they affect (a) the public carrier and (b) the shipper and merchant, whereas the economic influences resulting from the rates and conditions of the ocean carriage of the staples affect most keenly the producers and the consumers.

"GODFATHERS."

From the facts elicited at these inquiries it would seem as though there are "godfathers," so to speak, on the lookout for all the interests involved excepting for those of the staples. There is a godfather for iron, the Steel Trust; a godfather for agricultural implements, the Harvester Trust; a godfather for oils, the Standard Oil Trust; there is a godfather for the carriers, the Shipping Rings; a godfather for the commission men and the dealers handling the "package traffic," the chamber of commerce and the board of trade; but there is no godfather for the staples of agriculture, no godfather to represent the interests of the producer and of the consumer.

But the question arises: Would it have made any practical difference to the outcome if the interests of the producer and of the consumer had been represented at these inquiries? Let us see.

It seems to me that no matter how competent the testimony offered by a body representing the farmers or the consumers, no matter how honest the committee before which such testimony would be given, no matter how able the proposals for legislation which that committee might draft, it would all be ineffective unless the evidence given indicated the international bearing of the subject and unless the findings deduced therefrom recommended action on international lines. So long as the findings would fail to recommend international action, they must necessarily fall short of applying adequate means to the ends in view. That this is worthy of serious consideration will be apparent from the following:

WHOM DOES IT CONCERN?

In the case of "package traffic" the terms and conditions of ocean carriage mainly concern the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer. In the case of "bulk traffic," the traffic in the staples of agriculture, the terms and conditions of ocean carriage concern the economic welfare of the people everywhere.

To illustrate, under "package traffic," whether the rate on shipments of shoes or cutlery, for instance, be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, affects the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer.

But with "bulk traffic" the case is different. In the carriage of the staples of agriculture, whether the rate be too low or too high, whether it be fixed or whether it fluctuate, whether the conditions be advantageous or disadvantageous, concerns not merely the carrier, the shipper, and the dealer, but it concerns the economic condition of the people everywhere, as will be shown further on.

At this time it would be well to bear in mind that, while on the one hand "package traffic" comprises that class of merchandise which is bought and sold by private purchase and sale, by private contract, "bulk traffic," on the other hand, comprises in the main the staples of agriculture which are bought and sold in the world's bourses and exchanges at the world's price.

THE WORLD'S PRICE.

And what do we mean when we say the "world's price"?

We mean the price that is tendered and accepted in the world's bourses and exchanges, which we might call the world's auction rooms. And how is this price arrived at?

The first factor in arriving at the world's price is the prevailing opinion as to the state of the world's supply. If the supply be above the normal, the price is expected to fall below the normal; if the supply be below the normal, the price is expected to rise above the normal.

By "supply" we do not mean the quantity produced or available in any one locality, in any one country; we mean the total world's supply. The supply in any given State may be above the normal, and yet, at the same time, it be below the normal for the world, the price in that State should nevertheless be high. Or, vice versa, the supply in a given State may be below the normal, yet if the world's supply be above the normal the price in that State should be low.

But the supply is by no means the only factor in the formation of the world's price. There is another factor, and an important one—the cost of ocean carriage. If the average cost of ocean carriage be above the normal, it should correspondingly reduce the price paid to the producer below the normal. And, on the contrary, if the average cost of ocean carriage be below the normal, it should correspondingly raise the price paid to the producer above the normal.

Therefore calculations on rational lines for arriving at a knowledge of what the world's price ought to be should, first of all, take into consideration the status of the world's supply, and, secondly, the status of the cost of ocean carriage.

THE EFFECT OF FIXED RATES.

If there were fixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples, the Liverpool buyer would be able to make offers for given quantities of wheat, for instance, on a basis of rational calculations. But let us take the case as it stands at present. A shipper at Buenos Aires receives an order for wheat to be delivered in Liverpool at the ruling world's price, at, say, \$1 a bushel; how much should he pay for that wheat at Buenos Aires? If the cost of delivery is, say, 10 cents a bushel, the world's price should then be 90 cents a bushel in Buenos Aires. If the cost of delivery is 30 cents, the world's price in Buenos Aires should then be 70 cents. But if he is to ship the wheat in 30 or 60 days' time, how is the shipper to tell what the cost of carriage will then be? As the rates for the ocean carriage of the staples are not fixed, how is he to know? He does not know.

As we have seen, the Chamber of Commerce of New York states that wheat is carried at one time free of charge as ballast and at another time at a charge of 10d. and 12d. per bushel; and the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce writes that "rates fluctuate from day to day, and a rate reported to-day might be twice as high or half as low to-morrow." Therefore the shipper must guess, and so must everyone else guess, so long as rates are unfixed. If the shipper wins on the guess, what he wins comes directly out of the pocket of the producer; if he loses, he tries hard to recoup himself in his next deal, and also out of the producer's pocket.

But this is only the beginning of the mischief. The confusion arising out of the system of unfixed rates for ocean carriage of the staples and the consequent uncertainty in price determining lead to economic evils so far-reaching as to affect the people everywhere.

A comprehensive grasp of the significance of this evil may be obtained by the consideration of the following:

PRIVATE SALE AND PUBLIC SALE.

In the case of "package freight," of chairs, stoves, shoes, etc., the rise or fall in the rates of ocean carriage on the same hardly affects their home price or their foreign price. If, for instance, the cost of ocean carriage on pianos were to advance from \$5 to \$20 each, it need not necessarily follow that owing to the \$15 advance in freight rates all the pianos in the exporting country would decline by \$15 or advance by \$15 in the importing country, for the "package traffic" merchandise is sold by private contract—by private sale. But with the "bulk freight," with the staples of agriculture, the case is quite different. Being sold on the world's bourses and exchanges, at the world's price, it necessarily follows that a rise in ocean freight rates at one or more leading ports of an exporting country, by reducing the price on the quantity exported must necessarily reduce the price on the remaining quantity in the home market, for the buyer on the bourses or exchanges, whether he buys for export or for home use, pays the same price.

We can thus see how sensitive to change is the world's price and the home price of the staples when influenced by unfixed rates for ocean carriage. Were there fixed rates for the carriage of the staples, subject, say, to 30 or 60 days' notice of change, as is the case with the "package traffic," it would then settle the major evil in the question before us, the evil of constant and unnecessary price disturbances.

RAISE AND LOWER THE PRICE AT WILL.

But apart from such disturbances, under the present system of unfixed rates there is yet another point which calls for our consideration.

Under present conditions the chief directors of a few of the larger shipping rings, by federating their efforts, are in a position to raise and lower, by previous arrangement, the prices of the staples in any and all of the principal ports of the world. Acting under exclusive and advance knowledge of the rates they will charge they could lower the price of the staples by raising the cost of carriage and then, directly or indirectly, buy them in the bourses. They could then raise the price of the staples by lowering the cost of carriage, when they would sell. They could thus, at will, and by arrangement, lower the price of the product and buy, then raise the price and sell, and pocket the difference.

But the economic loss occasioned by such raising and lowering of prices at will would be very much greater than the amount the directors of the shipping rings might pocket, for raising or lowering the cost of carriage means raising or lowering the price of the staples on the home market directly, and raising or lowering the world's price indirectly.

Besides this species of mischief, there is, however, yet another within the power of the federated shipping rings; it is within their power, as we have seen from the case of Baltimore, to make and unmake ports, and through this to raise or lower the economic status of the nations. And this power is the more dangerous since such directors of shipping rings are irresponsible and free to act on the lines indicated. They are not expected to be guided by altruistic motives nor by high and statesmanlike political considerations.

"PACKAGE TRAFFIC" AND "BULK TRAFFIC."

Moreover, the fact that the "package traffic," representing 2,000 out of every 9,000 tons, enjoys fixed rates, whilst the "bulk traffic," the traffic in the staples, the traffic that represents 7,000 out of every 9,000 tons, is carried at unfixed rates, is in itself a terrible indictment of the present mode of procedure. Here we see that the price of the annual world's production of the staples, the value of which we may roughly estimate at a hundred billion dollars a year, and which represents the foodstuffs and the raw material for clothing and for house furnishing of all the people of the world, is permitted to be battledored and shuttlecocked through the action of the federated shipping rings.

We are thus forced to the conclusion that it is possible under this system for a few powerful directors of federated shipping rings to exert more effective economic control over the nations than can be exerted by any president, emperor, king, or prince; and so long as these federate shipping rings have it in their power to dictate at will the rise and fall in price of the world's food products, of the world's raw materials for clothing and for furnishing, so long do they, in reality, usurp a power which does not belong to them, a power which they should not have.

As matters stand at the present time, the unfixed rates for ocean carriage tend to convert the bourses and exchanges into price storm centers, storm centers which constantly give rise to waves of violent price disturbances, reacting at times in every direction.

Now, what harm do these price disturbances do?

What harm do they not do?

Unfixed rates of ocean carriage for the staples disturb, impede, and throw out of gear the whole mechanism of exchange.

FREE PLAY.

Right here we may aptly borrow the figure of the factory given by President Wilson in his book, *The New Freedom*. Here is a workshop; the overhead and underneath shafting, the journals, the pulleys, and the belts are all lined out, true, straight, trim, taut, and oiled, and all is well. But if the shafting be sprung or the journals unoled, the whole mechanism will be thrown out of gear.

It is just so in the industrial world. The law of competition should be permitted full and free play with no interference to impede its operation. But experience has made it plain over and over again that in the world of industry there is just one field in which competition, if allowed to operate, leads in the end to the "reductio ad absurdum" of the whole competitive system. The field that I refer to is that of transportation; competition in transportation impedes and interferes with the free play of competition in other and important fields.

This fact has been brought home so clearly to the American people that they have enacted laws excluding the railway carriers from the domain of competition by placing the regulation and control of rates in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. And the same reasoning that holds good for the regulation and control of railroad rates by an Interstate Commerce Commission would, as was shown before, likewise hold good for the regulation and control of ocean carriage through an International Commerce Commission.

The manner, now arbitrary, now fortuitous, in which the rates for ocean carriage of the staples are fixed; the lightning-like rapidity with which they are made to change; the gravity of the economic disturbances to which such sudden changes give rise; the far-reaching interrelated nature of their effects; the reaction produced by changes of rates in the ports of one nation on prices in the ports of another nation show clearly that if there is reason for placing domestic carriers under national regulation and control, there is yet stronger reason why ocean carriers should be placed under international regulation and control. If this contention be admitted, it then follows that my resolution for an international official conference to consider this matter is in order.

THE SITUATION.

And now let us briefly review the situation as made manifest by the British and American inquiries. We may summarize it as follows:

There are, at present, two modes of conducting the traffic business of ocean carriage:

(a) Through unrestricted competition;

(b) Through shipping rings and conferences.

In the final analysis, however, it would seem that unrestricted competition in ocean carriage is, in reality, but a mere hypothesis, for, as has been shown, such unrestricted competition invariably resolves itself down into a monopoly.

And again, if we examine the shipping rings and conferences which are, at present, the normal condition, we shall see that this condition also is but another name for monopoly.

We are thus brought face to face with the fact that both unrestricted competition and shipping rings alike lead to monopoly in the business of ocean carriage.

And what about this monopoly? In the American report we find the following:

"All monopolies are liable to abuse, and in our foreign carrying trade the monopoly obtained by the conference lines has not been subjected to any legal control." (Vol. 4, p. 304.)

And on the same head the British report says:

"All monopolies are liable to abuse to a greater or less extent unless they are strictly limited, either by the nature of the case, by legislation, or by some form of supervision." (Report of the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings, vol. 1, p. 98.)

And now it will be interesting to note the measures proposed by the American and by the British committees for holding in check this "monopoly," for curbing this "abuse."

BRITISH AND AMERICAN RECOMMENDATIONS.

On the one hand, the British commission offers the following recommendation:

"Shippers and merchants in a given trade should form themselves into an association, so that they might be able to present a united front to the conference when any controversy arose." (Report of the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings, vol. 1, p. 85.)

The American committee, on the other hand, recommends:

"That navigation companies, firms, or lines engaged in the foreign trade of the United States be brought under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission as regards the regulation of rates, the approval of contracts entered into with other water carriers, with shippers, or with American railroads." (Vol. 4, p. 419.)

Thus, as we see, the British recommendation is for unofficial, the American for official, action, and both recommendations view the question purely from the national standpoint.

So far as the "package traffic" is concerned, these recommendations might be adequate. But would they cover the needs of the case were the "bulk traffic," the staples of agriculture, under consideration? I do not think so; for as the import, export, and home prices of the staples are governed by the world's price the formation of which is influenced by the cost of carriage to the principal market centers of the world, and as any one nation is unable to regulate and control the terms and conditions of ocean carriage in the principal world's ports, therefore all attempts to regulate or control ocean carriage of the staples by any one nation must be inadequate.

INTERNATIONAL REGULATION AND CONTROL.

It would therefore seem to me that the nations should consider the advisability of establishing an international commerce commission for the regulation and control of ocean carriage. The influence of such international regulation and control, extending to the principal ports of the world, would supplement the world's official crop reports in guiding the formation of the world's price on an equitable basis. The first division of this work is already being performed; the crop reports now given out by the institute, under the auspices of the nations, are the official and authoritative summary of the world's supply. When this work would be supplemented by that of the international commerce commission it would then permit of rational calculations anywhere as to what the home price of the staples should be in its relation to the world's price.

And right here it may be apposite to relate an incident in the up-building of the institute pertinent to the subject.

Some eight years ago I called on Mr. James Wilson, the then Secretary of Agriculture, in an endeavor to win him over to the needs for an official international crop-reporting service. Mr. Wilson then expressed the opinion that such a service would be of no economic value to the United States. He claimed that the Department of Agriculture had its own crop-reporting service, which was sufficient for the needs of the American people, and that there was no call to enter on some new work which might serve the interests of other nations.

Subsequently, however, Mr. Wilson saw the matter in the light in which it was presented to him. He saw that all the crop reporting that the United States might do would be inadequate for the end in view; that the crop reports of one nation only are inadequate as a basis for arriving at the world's price, for the world's price is based on the world's supply; and in order to have the official reports of the world's supply it is necessary that crop reporting be done by all the nations of the world, and that the reports, and the world's summary of the same, be given out officially at regular intervals under international treaty. When Mr. Wilson saw this, he then favored the International Institute of Agriculture for this work.

AN INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Similarly, in the case of ocean carriage, action by a nation, limited to the regulation and control of the "package traffic" within its own country, can be had through a national institution like the Interstate Commerce Commission. The jurisdiction of such a commission might even be extended to embrace the ocean carriage of a nation at home and abroad; but if all this is intended to influence the equitable relation between the home price and the world's price of the staples it will surely fall far short of accomplishing what is intended. For, as has been shown, one of the principal factors in arriving at the world's price of the staples is a knowledge of the world's supply, and in arriving at a knowledge of what their home price should be in relation to their world's price the leading factor would be the fixed rates for their ocean carriage. And just as the official report of the world's supply may only be had by means of an international crop-reporting service, so regulation and control of the ocean carriage of the staples may only be had through the medium of an international commerce commission.

Such an international commerce commission could be instituted by the nations under a treaty which should provide for its mode of representation and procedure. If it were granted powers similar to those of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, provision might then be made for it to work in conjunction with a branch of The Hague tribunal, especially constituted and empowered to adjudicate on points of law which might arise out of the commission's functions and decisions. But if its powers were limited to those of a consultative and advisory body, its delegates could then sit in session together with the representatives of the carriers of the shipping interests. The question whether the proposed international commerce commission should be granted powers to act, or whether its functions should be limited to those of a consultative and advisory body, may properly come before the conference called for in my resolution.

FIXED RATES FOR BULK TRAFFIC.

And now it is in order to review some of the objections likely to be raised to fixed rates for "bulk traffic."

The shipowner, for instance, is likely to say: "The unit of transportation by water is the total capacity of a ship. We can not cut off so many feet, as the railroad can, and leave them in New York if we do not want to use them." (Vol. 2, p. 1256.)

It would appear to me that this objection is more seeming than real, for a train of cars can not profitably be run unless there is freight for it, any more than a ship can be run without freight. If you are running a railway you must have freight to fill your cars or get out of business.

"But," it may be asked, "would not such a system of fixed rates overlook the character of the service rendered? Here, for instance, is a costly liner which makes the trip from New York to Liverpool in five days, and here are slower boats, the tramps and the sailing vessels; would the fixed rates apply equally to all?"

And the answer is: The fixed rates could be established according to the quality of the service. Rates could be fixed for first-class, second-class, and third-class service.

The next point that might be raised is that "bulk freight" is a physical necessity for a ship, without which it can not sail, for "the ship must be loaded down to its marks." This being the case, the carrier must be left free to hunt up this "bulk freight" wherever he can get it, and secure it sometimes at a high price, sometimes at a low price.

I believe this objection is also only seemingly valid. The fact is the "bulk freight" either has to be shipped or it does not have to be shipped. If it does not, there will be no use running after it; if it does, then it will come of its own accord.

At this point the carrier is likely to interrupt, saying, "This is all nonsense, for we certainly would have no shiploads if we did not run after the freight, and run after it on the 'give-and-take' method."

And here the carrier is correct: It is all nonsense so far as conditions are to-day. But would not conditions be different under the proposed international commerce commission, under the proposed fixed rates? With no fixed rates the shrewd shipper of "bulk freight" knows well that at certain times the carrier is bound to tag after him. But with fixed rates for the season the shipper's game would be at an end. He would then always be glad enough to rush to the shipping office and "book" room for freight at the earliest moment possible; all of which would tend to promote the natural and steady flow of freight toward the ships.

THE DIVISION OF LABOR.

"But," says the objector, "would not this proposal to single out the ocean carrier by subjecting him to international control place him at a disadvantage? Would it not materially interfere with his earning power? Would it not reduce his profits?"

I do not think so. I think it can be shown that the adoption of the proposal would be advantageous not only to the producers and the consumers, but also to the carriers.

"How?"

Let us see. By the term "civilization" do we not really mean that cumulative state of progress rendered possible by the division of labor? The savage does everything by himself. He is his own carpenter, his own tailor, his own architect, his own carrier. But, as we know, such work is far inferior to that accomplished under the division of labor.

And this division of labor takes place not only in the handicrafts, but also in the field of commerce. In the field of government, and in the field of science. It is, in fact, but another term for "economies." In short, specialization of functions, division of labor, renders effort more effective and more economical. This being so, why not extend the system of the division of labor to the regulation and control of ocean carriage? If the specialization of functions, the division of labor, is beneficial, in what field can it be more profitably employed than in this important one of ocean carriage, a field which concerns not only the shipowners but the governments and the people everywhere?

Fortunately the channels through which the division of labor could be realized in the regulation and control of ocean carriage can readily be made available.

CHANNELS AVAILABLE FOR THE SERVICE.

First of all there could be the proposed international commerce commission, consisting of delegates who should be experts on the subject of ocean carriage. They should be in close official relationship with those departments and bureaus in the various governments which deal, directly and indirectly, with the questions of internal carriage in their relation to foreign carriage.

In the second place there is the International Institute of Agriculture, which could be officially authorized to place itself in communication in the several adhering countries with (a) the chambers of commerce and boards of trade, and with (b) the national agricultural organizations, all with the end in view of gathering information toward the synchronization of incoming and outgoing cargoes, said information to be compiled and regularly transmitted to the international commerce commission.

In the third place, a branch of The Hague Tribunal could be constituted and empowered to adjudicate on points of international law which might arise out of the commission's functions and decisions.

It is not difficult to see that all this, when once in operation, would be likely to bring about two important results.

THE PLAY OF FORCES.

First, by promoting the synchronization of incoming and outgoing cargoes it would tend to remove the uncertainties and perplexities which now beset the ocean carrier's business. In short, the focusing of information under the proposed system would make it possible to replace the present unfixed rates for the staples now abnormally low, now again abnormally high, by fixed average rates.

Second, such fixed average rates replacing the present uncertainties, violent fluctuations, and consequent losses would tend toward the more equitable formation of the world's price of the staples, and by steadying that equitable price would promote the economic interests of the people everywhere.

In other words, the adoption of the proposed system would set in motion a play of forces which, beginning in the township with the farmer and his product, working upward through the several channels indicated, thence through the international commerce commission, would tend to normalize the ebb and flow of the economic currents throughout the world of commerce and industry.

THE INTEREST OF THE PRODUCER.

And now we may expect the producer to intervene. "May not unfixed rates in reality mean low rates? Has it not been shown that

under unfixed rates the carrier is often compelled to transport the staples as ballast free of any charge? Does not this system thus provide the lowest rate? And is it not likely that all this may profit the producer?

Let us see. If the shipper were to give the producer his share of the difference between the price he actually received and the price he ought to have received whenever the staples were carried as ballast, then the above remarks might to some extent be justified. But how is the shipper, buying as he does in the wheat pit, to hunt up and identify the original owner of the product? And even if the shipper could hunt him up, what would induce him to give back part of his gains to the producer? Nothing that I know of. There is not even a remote chance that the producer will profit by the levy which the shipper raises on the carrier whenever he can compel him to carry freight free as ballast.

The producer's interests can not be served by abnormally low freight rates any more than by abnormally high freight rates; but they can be served by the fixed average rates which the adoption of the proposal here advocated would permit. Such fixed published rates would make it possible for the producer anywhere to arrive at a just approximation of what his home price ought to be in its relation to the world's price, and this would insure to him the best possible results.

But supposing some farmer, working, say, 160 acres of land, were to ask: "Of what value would the adoption of this proposal be to me, since I neither export my product nor sell it to exporters?"

The answer is a simple one: the home price is derived from the world's price, and the world's price is influenced by the cost of ocean carriage. Let the cost of ocean carriage fluctuate through unfixed rates, and it causes the world's price to fluctuate, which, in turn, causes fluctuation of the home price. Steadying the cost of ocean carriage steadies the world's price and steadies the home price of the staples, thus benefiting the farmer who neither exports nor sells to exporters as well as the farmers who export.

THE GOVERNMENTS.

Let us now inquire how the proposal for fixed rates under an international commerce commission would be received by the Governments.

It seems likely that it would be favored by the Governments of the exporting nations, the nations which have the staples of agriculture for sale. But how about the importing nations, the nations that are compelled to buy?

Had this question been asked some 25 years ago we might have expected the statesman of that day to have given some such answer as the following:

"We are not here as champions of altruism, nor for promoting doctrinaire theories as to equitable distribution. We know what we want. We want foodstuffs and raw materials at the very lowest price at which it may be possible for us to obtain them. The lower our influences can depress the world's price of the staples the better it is for us, the more abundant will be the food of our people and the cheaper will be the raw materials for our factories."

But, with the progress of our times, the statesman of to-day is likely to reason differently: he is likely to answer on this wise:

"We can not afford to force prices in the exporting countries below the normal. Our investments in those countries, the need we have of them as buyers of our manufactured goods, are sufficient inducements to warrant us in using our efforts to influence commerce in the staples along perfectly just and equitable lines, and this both at home and abroad."

THE STATESMAN.

But how will the case stand with those nations which possess a powerful merchant marine? Let us see what the statesman in such a country would have been likely to say some 25 years ago.

"We are not concerned with prices and their equities in foreign countries. In order to conserve and increase our national strength we are primarily concerned in the preservation and development of our merchant marine. We can not therefore afford to do anything that would be likely to hamper its freedom or subject its movements to international regulation."

But in our day the answer is likely to be different. The modern statesman is likely to reason:

"While a powerful merchant marine is essential to the well-being of a State, there is another consideration of far greater importance, and that is the well-being of all the people in that State, the well-being of its men, of its women, of its children. Our people must have work; they must eat and wear clothes and furnish their dwellings, and all of this is influenced by stability and equity in the price of the staples. Now, while the merchant marine may force prices in certain markets below their due level, it by no means follows that the products thus lowered will reach the consumers, the people of our State, at that low level. But it is certain that the deteriorating influences set going by the unfixed rates for ocean carriage, with the speculation they give rise to, will adversely affect not only the producer, but also the consumer."

There is yet another phase of the question which the statesman will, no doubt, bear in mind when considering the merchant marine, and that is the need of preserving the economic stability of the colonial possessions of the buying countries. The mother country may be a buyer of the staples; the colonies are almost always sellers. The lamb's gentle bleat will be likely to meet with a sympathetic response from its dam.

THE PROTECTIONIST.

But what will be the opinion of the statesman in a protection country which is neither an extensive exporter nor an importer of the staples?

Twenty-five years ago it is quite likely that such a statesman would have said:

"Yes; I see the wanton waste caused by design or fortuity in forcing the world's price to deflect from the line of the normal through the influences exercised by unfixed rates for the ocean carriage of the staples. It is a grievous injury to many, no doubt. But thanks to our system of protection, and thanks to our independence from the influences exercised by the exporting and importing markets, we are not affected by the evil trend thus imparted. Protection gives us our own special normal, our own price, independent of the world's price."

But the modern statesman is likely to reason:

"Protection is but another name for an artificial barrier. We have the artificial barrier, it is true, but for all that, and above and beyond it, the world's price rises here as it does in every other part of the world. We have the world's price, first of all, and on top of that the artificial

enhancement which protection gives to our producers, and which comes out of the pockets of our consumers. It thus follows that we are fully as much interested in maintaining the world's price at its normal level as are the exporting or importing nations."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

In summing up my argument in favor of the resolution, I wish to say that just as the regulation and control of the world's reports on the production of the staples required official international action, so the regulation and control of the terms and conditions for their ocean carriage also requires official international action.

Without such international action there can be no guaranty for equitable and fixed rates in the carriage of the staples. The absence of these equitable and fixed rates must necessarily give rise to disturbances throughout the economic world by forcing values to deflect from the line of the normal.

In concluding my arguments in favor of the adoption of the resolution, I wish to say that there seem to be three ways of disposing of the question before us. One would be to leave matters alone, to let the problems solve themselves. Another would be to live in the hope that the carriers may presently become so wise and disinterested that they will solve the question of their own accord and set matters right. But if in this matter, as in all others, adequate means are essential to the attainment of rational ends, we are forced to set aside both of these ways. This leaves the third way, that of action on the lines of the resolution submitted, the working out of the system indicated therein.

An impartial review of the subject must lead the statesman to the conclusion that this question can not be solved by action on empirical lines. The problems of ocean carriage as they affect any one port, or all the ports of any one country, are, after all, but phases and fractions, portions of the question when it is considered as a whole. Viewed as a whole the problems transcend the limits of any one country; they are interrelated and concern all the countries of the world.

The time has passed when the statesman could dismiss this question with a wave of the hand. Population everywhere is increasing by leaps and bounds, and so is popular education. All this is equivalent to saying that wants are increasing. And it is clear that the highest aim of good statesmanship is to see that the demands arising out of these increased wants are not stupidly and unjustly frustrated by causes which have their root in inequities in the formation of the world's price of the staples.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the resolution for the moral effect it will have on the subject matter. I am in favor of it for the same reason that action by a great government has had on other problems in which other nations are interested. I realize that there is wide distinction between the Interstate Commerce Commission fixing rates and the almost impossibility of having an international commerce commission. But I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that we have been able in the transportation of boxed manufactured goods, which constitutes two-sevenths of our foreign merchandise, to fix the rate for 60 days upon transoceanic shipment. I want to put the proposition up to these gentlemen here why we can not fix the rates on the other five-sevenths. A man that manufactures shoes in Boston and sells them in Liverpool or London or in Brussels has the rate fixed for 60 days at which he may ship the shoes. Why can not the men that export wheat and cotton have the rate fixed in some way?

Of course, I understand that there are many economical features entering into the shipment of agricultural products—the amount produced in other countries, the distance exported for shipment, the avenue through which the shipment is to be made; but no man has assigned a reason in this discussion why you can not fix the rate on agricultural products as you can on manufactured products. Another feature of the proposition is that the farmer is not concerned about the extremely low rates or the ordinary rate that the gentleman from Illinois speaks about.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. No; I can not, I have not the time. I want to call attention to the fact that it is not the farmer who gets the low rate. It is the elevator man and the shipper and not the farmer who get the low rate. There can be no doubt but that the International Institute of Agriculture has greatly widened the field of information for all the nations that adhere to it, consisting of 56 in this international agreement. It has widened the field of information by publishing the amount of agricultural products weekly, the demand for them in the different sections of the country, and giving information upon which our own people are interested.

I recognize another feature, and that is to establish effectually a standardization of rates we must have an agreement of some kind between the great shippers of this country and the people to whom the grain is shipped. I recognize that transcontinental freight rates are largely fixed and controlled by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Competition gradually determined closely what the rate should be. When you induct into the problem transoceanic commerce you come in contact with economic conditions that affect not only ourselves but our customers abroad. The adoption of this resolution can not do us any harm. This Congress should show that its purpose is to regulate, if it can be done, ocean freight rates, as far

as possible, for the products of the farm that constitute one-half of our export trade.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired and all time has expired.

Mr. FITZHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, September 2, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 604) requesting the Secretary of Labor to transmit to the House of Representatives information concerning public aid for home owning and housing of working people in foreign countries, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1122), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (S. 6039) for the coinage of certain gold and silver coins in commemoration of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1126), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9584) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1127), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 598) directing report made by Maj. Eli A. Helmick to the War Department relative to the purchase of supplies be furnished the House of Representatives, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1123), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. ANTHONY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 543) to correct the military record of John T. Haines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1125), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18587) granting a pension to Mary Shields, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 18629) for the establishment of a land-bond bureau in the United States Treasury, the establishment of a farm-loan bureau in the

Department of Agriculture, and to reduce the rate of interest on farm loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 18630) to make it unlawful to ship in commerce between the States any grain or seed for the purposes of sale or barter for use in agriculture which are falsely labeled or branded, or falsely represented, and to fix a penalty for the violation of this act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 18631) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 18632) to encourage the development of the American merchant marine and to promote commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 18633) to amend section 1 of the act of May 30, 1908, relating to emergency currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 331) relating to the awards and payments thereon in what are commonly known as the Plaza cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 332) to enable the Department of Agriculture, through the Bureau of Soils and any other bureau, to locate and report the soil areas in Southern States that are adapted to the successful production of cattle and hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) authorizing the President to temporarily suspend the dealings in futures of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 18634) granting an increase of pension to William W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 18635) for the relief of the estate of Henry McCarty, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DUPRE: A bill (H. R. 18636) for the relief of Anaise F. Zeringue and the estate of Mathilde C. Zeringue; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 18637) granting a pension to Joseph H. Bryson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 18638) granting an increase of pension to John M. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18639) for the relief of John Burk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELEY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 18640) granting a pension to George W. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 18641) granting an increase of pension to Ezra A. Bristol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 18642) granting an increase of pension to Clark C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: Petition of L. C. French, Ruth Craft, and others, of Knoxville, Tenn., urging Federal legislation for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of J. Blumenthal's Sons, of Altoona, Pa., protesting against any additional tax on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of the Knights of the Maccabees of the World, of Pomona, Cal., favoring the Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of the Central Federated Union, favoring the passage of the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DERSHEM: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Milroy, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of the Connecticut State Medical Society, relative to mental examination of arriving immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Connecticut Leaf Tobacco Association, against increased taxes on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Ward 19 Democratic Club, of Boston, Mass., protesting against manipulation in prices of foodstuffs and the exportation of same to foreign countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILL: Memorial of the Socialist Party of Hudson County, N. J., relative to prohibition of the exportation of foodstuffs, etc., for use during European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of East Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of the Hobson-Sheppard bill for national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the executive committee of the Connecticut Deeper Waterways Association, of New Haven, Conn., favoring the passage of the pending rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of various business men of Elk Creek, Nemaha, and Verdon, all in the State of Nebraska, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the San Francisco Retail Cigar Dealers' Association, against any increase in the revenue tax on cigars and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the San Francisco Labor Council, protesting against the passage of the Hobson nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of House bill 5139, providing pensions for superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of the Connecticut Deeper Waterways Association, favoring the passage of the rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Gullford Grange, No. 81, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEVENS of California: Petition of C. A. Cary and 20 other citizens of Los Angeles County, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, individual petitions of Martha Harries and 120 other citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, letters from the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, letters from the Labor Council of San Francisco, Cal., against Government printing on envelopes; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, telegram from various retail cigar dealers of San Francisco, protesting against increased revenue tax on cigars and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Prince George County, Va., asking for an investigation of the Milliken bill in regard to the establishment of a personal rural credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Prince Edward County, Va., asking for investigation of bill relative to a personal rural credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petitions of 25 members of the Empire State Club of Chicago, Ill., relative to House joint resolution 282, for due credit to Dr. F. A. Cook for his polar efforts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.